DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 086 081 HE 004 985

TITLE	The Future College Executive.
INSTITUTION	Boston Coll., Chestnut Hill, Mass.
PUB DATE	Jun 73
NOTE	92p.; Papers presented at the Conference in Higher Education, June 18 and 19, 1973, Boston, Massachusetts
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Responsibility; *Administrator Role; *College Administration; Conference Reports; Educational Administration; *Higher Education; *University Administration

ABSTRACT

This conference report examines various problems facing university administrators and discusses the future role of the executive in American colleges and universities. Conference papers concern the future college executive; efficiency, accountability and the college executive; administrative concerns; and the rights of college administrators. (MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 086081

THE FUTURE COLLEGE EXECUTIVE

Harlan Cleveland, President
University of Hawaii

Joseph F. Kauffman, Professor of Higher Education,
University of Wisconsin

Jacquelyn Mattfeld, Associate Provost and Dean of
Academic Affairs, Brown University

William C. McInnes, S.J., President, University of
San Francisco

HIGHER EDUCATION
BOSTON COLLEGE

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 004985

CONFERENCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION
June 18 and 19, 1973
The Colonnade
Boston, Massachusetts

ED 086081

THE FUTURE COLLEGE EXECUTIVE

Conference in Higher Education
June 18, 19, 1973
The Colonnade
Boston, Massachusetts

CONTENTS

Introduction — Michael Anello, Director, Division of Higher Education, Boston College

The Future College Executive — Harlan Cleveland, President, University of Hawaii

Efficiency, Accountability and the College Executive — Joseph F. Kauffman, Professor of Higher Education, University of Wisconsin

Administration of What, for Whom? — Jacquelyn Mattfeld, Associate Provost and Dean of Academic Affairs, Brown University

What Rights to College Administrators Need Anyway? — William C. McInnes, S. J., President, University of San Francisco

INTRODUCTION

Much scholarly and professional interest has been devoted in the last fifty years to the study of leadership and the making of the executive. Max Weber, Fred Taylor, Victor Janowitz, James Mooney, Chester Barnard, were some of the early thinkers who attempted to construct a rational model for the scientific study of administration and human relations. Their focus was primarily on complex organizations in business, industry and the military. Over the years, their vocabulary drifted into the field of higher education and the fashionable phrases became "decision-making", "management system", "accountability", "efficiency", "input-output", "productivity", and so on.

The early colonial colleges were managed by priests and ministers; the colleges of the 18th and 19th century were managed by the best scholars on the faculty, those with a knack for administration. Recently, the approach to setting things right in our colleges and universities has been to improve managerial efficiency. Some of us have learned the hard way that efficiency often takes us rapidly where we didn't want to go in the first place.

Assuming that colleges and universities are more complex institutions than they were previously, does college management require a new breed of executive? Moreover, who decides where the college is going? Who is accountable for that direction? How much say should the faculty and other constituencies have? How do we determine the ethics of college administration? Is there a need for a different kind of administrator?

What special qualities did administrators of the past have? Will we ever see executive responsiblity of the quality demonstrated by Gilman of Chicago, Wayland of Michigan, Jordan of Stanford, White of Cornell, Eliot of Harvard, or Eli Nott whose tenure as president of Union College lasted for 60 years?

What is the problem when men of the stature of Franklin Murphy of UCLA, Stahr of Indiana, Kerr of Berkely, Alden of Ohio, Kirk of Columbia, Homer Babbidge of Connecticut, resign their presidencies?

The purpose of this conference is to look at some of these problems and to provide an opportunity to discuss the future role of the executive in American colleges and universities.

Boston College
June, 1973

Michael Anello, Director
Division of Higher Education

THE FUTURE COLLEGE EXECUTIVE

Harlan Cleveland

Peering into the future is now the nation's largest profession and its most popular parlor game. A few Cassandras and Pollyannas make the news with their predictions, but we are all trying to foretell the future. Without guessing how things are likely to be five years, ten years, fifteen years from now, none of us could plan ahead for our businesses, our professional lives, our families, and ourselves.

"Who would have thought, a few years ago, that. . .?" How many times a week do you hear, or utter, that phrase? Who would have foretold the price of land, the congestion of cities, the profusion of credit-cards, the speed of computers, the pollution of the elements, the changes in clothing and hair styles, the openness of sex, the skepticism toward armies and nationalism and marriages and God?

And yet, knowing that the future is enigmatic and improbable, you have asked me to tell you this morning what it is going to be like to be a college or university executive in tomorrow's environment. The best I can do is consider with you today's environment: the trends already obvious may be the best clues to working conditions for the future college executive.

Picture a large traffic intersection where seven streets come together, each carrying traffic both ways -- fourteen directions in all. In real life, the nearest analog might be the Etoile in Paris, where all day long, in a massive tangled slow-moving complexity, Parisians weave and shout and play "chicken" as they circle the great triumphal

arch and disturb the unknown dead with their klaxons. Place the college or university executive out in the middle of this confusion, with the assignment to analyze it and keep things moving.

The academic executive has always been a man or woman in the middle -- directing traffic by negotiating priorities, allocating scarcities, arbitrating arguments and calming tempers. Until very recently the executive stood, if not on a pedestal, at least on a traffic island -- protected from the bumpers, shielded from the headlights, raised above the honking and hollering, able to maintain a certain serenity while pointing directions and advocating bigger budgets for better traffic control.

But in my crystal ball, the central traffic island has been swept away and the future college executive dodges among his constituencies -- persuading, cajoling, lobbying, testifying, arbitrating, bargaining, averting where he can and postponing where he can't the seven everyday collisions in American higher education.

Four of the intersecting arteries carry collisions of purpose -- issues about power and preference, about who gets access to the skills and symbols of advancement and affluence -- issues like those in the wider polity, but intensified by concentration on a campus. The other three collision courses intersect at points of procedure. The arguments about purpose, about what the academy is for, are old familiar vehicles, but driven now by all kinds of people who look different and think in different ways from the old elites who piloted and profited from higher education. The procedural collisions are also worth our special attention -- both because arguments about procedure are so often surrogates for disagreements about policy, and because the three main procedural issues now bedeviling the academic are, I think, fundamentally new to

higher education.

II.

Collision No. 1, of course, is between the few and the many. This familiar confrontation is the stuff of social history in every age. It has been muted in American colleges and universities by a prosperity in which, for most of the past generation, there seemed plenty of room for all.

Nobody now argues that only an elite should go to college. It is no longer respectable even to oppose the principle of universal access to post-secondary education. The new question is this: how far should the chance for the many to go beyond high school pre-empt the chance for a growing number of the few to go beyond college to advanced graduate and professional training?

The earlier answer to the question "Who should be educated to cope with innovation and complexity?" was clear enough. The brighter children of the rich and highly born would be trained to manage things. Those from other families could content themselves with physical labor or, if they were unusually talented, with specialized and preferably manual artisanry. Later on, as the more industrialized societies required more educated people, the doctrine gained favor that all should get an equal start, but if some fell behind because of early disadvantages or racial discrimination or inability to speak correctly the language of the governing classes, that was not particularly serious because the need was still very great for common labor and skills not requiring general education.

But now, machines are taking over much of the physical drudgery, and computers, calculators and photocopiers are taking over more and more of the clerical and analytical tasks. Those rows of people copy-typing, doing arithmetic, and operating switchboards, or stamping and moulding and drilling and packaging, are becoming rows of machines doing those things, only faster and more dependably. The people are freed for more interesting work, for jobs that require thinking and planning and internalized ethical standards. Brains have to tell the stupid machines, which after all can only differentiate between zero and one, what to do and when and how, and fix them when they fail. And people have to solve the puzzle of working cooperatively with other people, studying how the whole system works so as to fit their work with the work of others.

The pyramidal structure in which recommendations go up and orders come down turns out to be no match for the size and complexity of the problems people now want to tackle. Modern organization systems are increasingly moved by a new dynamic of consultation, collective bargaining and lateral persuasion. These horizontal processes multiply the requirement for leadership and open up opportunities for any one with imagination, aptitude and self-starting energy to become tomorrow's agent of change.

In short, the kinds of jobs high school graduates used to do are increasingly done by automatic systems, and the kinds of jobs left for people to do require education and experience beyond the secondary level. Some of the new requirement for "college-level" training might well be done in the secondary schools. But the standardization of

curricula, the levelling of salaries, and the subordination of professionalism seem to be producing high schools less inclined and less able than ever before to prepare their compulsory students to cope with the new world of work-complexity.

And that is why, in the more industrialized societies, most young people will have to go to college, some kind of college. That is why most American parents today, if you ask them which of their children are candidates for post-secondary education, will express the hope that all their children will sooner or later go to college.

For some years it has been the declared policy of the State of Hawaii that "Every citizen who has completed high school or reached the age of 18, if he or she desires a chance for higher education, should find that chance somehow somewhere in the State-wide system of public higher education called the University of Hawaii". (Pursuant to that policy, one out of every 16 persons in the Hawaiian Islands was a student in some University program in the Spring of 1973.) In the Education Amendments of 1972 the United States Congress declared it to be national policy that every American is entitled to equal educational opportunity reaching two years beyond the compulsory 12 grades.

These new social intentions, expressed as "open admissions" policies in many public colleges, were the major engine of growth for American higher education during the 1960s. In parallel with the expansion of the whole post-secondary population from 2.3 million in 1950 to 8.3 million in 1972, graduate and professional schools were booming too. The demands for specialists to work in industry and the public

service (including the armed services) seemed insatiable. And the popularity of higher education was such that public budgets and private giving kept pace with both the rising intake of freshmen and the rising production of Ph.D.s and professional degrees.

Then the bubble burst. Campus disruptions, swelling budgets, and the intolerance of educators for systematic planning all contributed to the backlash. Governments and givers started asking before granting it how their money would be spent, and the dawn of accountability came up like thunder.

Quite suddenly, a pervasive austerity sharpens all the dilemmas which had been buried or bypassed in the continuous growth. If there is not enough money to pay all the professors (even, in some institutions, those with claims to academic tenure), it is no longer possible to teach all the students who want to study and offer all the programs for which there is student demand. Faculty-administration committees, searching for "warm bodies" and programs to cut off which are less central to the institution's future than the programs in which the committee members themselves are employed, quickly realize that "raising standards" would result in fewer students and permit the elimination of less experienced, untenured teachers; even more of the lower-division teaching can be done by graduate students, for the graduate programs on which the institution's general repute depends must of course be maintained. But the university's external critics, noting the sudden recession in the demand for graduate degree-holders and counting the comparative voting strength of the many and the few, counter with proposals to drop the more elitist forms of training in favor of wider

opportunity for lower-division and community-college students. More parents are interested in opportunities for freshmen than for Ph.D. candidates; more voters are moved by a politician's defense of vocational education than by the pleas of the graduate faculty.

In recent months the U.S. Government has systematically combed the Federal budget and excised all the money for graduate students it could find, on the premise that in all but a few specialized fields there are too many educated Americans already. The across-the-board cut discriminates against a whole generation -- it says that students ready for graduate work now should work for those who already have the advanced degrees, not compete with them. And it discriminates against the upward mobile parts of America: communities which are just beginning to produce graduate-school material are told to settle for second-class jobs under the Scions of families which "arrived" earlier.

So the ancient rivalry between the few and the many is reincarnated as open admissions versus selective admissions, the ambitious versus the accepted, the community colleges versus four-year colleges versus graduate schools, as they compete for higher-education dollars now that the sky is no longer the limit.

III.

The new constraints have also intensified the traditional controversies about what should be taught.

As James A. Perkins puts it, new entrance criteria based on social equality are on collision course with exit criteria, which are an expression of meritocracy: "Equality is in, meritocracy is out, and academic standards are caught in the middle.".

To the academic administrator, part of whose task is to help maintain the academic standards, Collision No. 2 presents itself in these terms: Should "college" be designed for the student's self-fulfillment, or to fulfill society's needs for manpower? A high proportion of those who with their gifts or tax payments purchase the right to criticize the academy seem to feel that the academy's main purpose is to produce people in vocational categories that "fit" the job market, or somebody's idea of what the job market ought to be.

Even if there were agreement that the purpose of higher education is to prepare students for their jobs after college, the science of manpower planning is so primitive that neither the college nor its students can have much confidence in official projections. Three years ago, there was still much talk of the teacher shortage; today there is clearly a glut of would-be teachers. In Italy, I understand, an unusual number of graduate lawyers are becoming policemen. In America, a growing proportion of Ph.D.s are joining community college faculties. That is not the way the manpower planners would have planned it. (But is it bad for Italian policemen to be sensitive to legal process, or for lower-division teachers to have personal experience in advanced research?)

In these circumstances students are increasingly, and wisely, inclined to hedge their bets by using their college years as preparation of Life as well as livelihood. Despite some current unemployment most of their experience has led them to believe that making a living will not be all that difficult. Contemporary American youth are the first generation in the history of mankind to be searching, en masse, for the answer to a new question: After affluence, what, Part of the contemporary crisis

in vocational education is its inability to define its role in industrialized societies where both instructors and their industrial sponsors are still hung up on the moral value of obsolescent forms of manual labor, and the students are searching not just for a meal-ticket but for Meaning.

In the liberal-arts programs, undergraduates are unwittingly creating budget crises by flocking into courses on art and religion, in institutions which had planned for them to take biophysics and political science. If society's needs, as determined in the short run by the market or the government, are not being served, because students are searching not so much for knowledge as for themselves, where should the college executive be allocating the money? Most academics would let the students choose, not just because that is the line of least resistance but because of an intuition that the student is as likely to be the best forecaster of his or her future lifework as a fluctuating job market or a government statistician. But internal budget allocations based on this permissive doctrine are not likely to be popular in legislatures or Lions Clubs downtown.

When students "vote with their feet" by crowding into the lectures on The Meaning of Life and boycotting the courses in econometrics, they are also illustrating Collision No. 3: Education for methodology or for values? The academy's students, and its outside critics too, notice that the vertical academic disciplines, built around clusters of related methodologies, are not in themselves very helpful in solving problems. No real-world problem can be fitted into the jurisdiction of a single academic department. As every city-dweller knows, we know every specialized thing about the modern city except how to "get it all together" to

make the city livable, efficient and safe. The real world is by nature interdisciplinary.

As they awaken to problem-solving, students therefore gravitate to those of the academy's offerings which seem to promise an interdisciplinary approach. These offerings are often disappointing. A course in environmental problems may be taught by an evangelist less eager to train analysts than to recruit zealots. Team-teaching by experts in several methodologies may leave the students as the classroom's only interdisciplinary thinkers -- just as the patient in a modern hospital comes to feel he is the institution's only generalist. Still, student preferences continue to favor offerings that promise to cut across the vertical structures of method and help them construct homemade ways of thinking about the situation as a whole.

The revolt against methodology is also powered by the quickening interest in ethics, which started long before Watergate. A growing number of students come to college after some life experience -- in the army or on the job or in a commune. They are groping for purpose, for effective ways of asking 'Why?" and "Where are we supposed to be going anyway?" Disciplines which seem neutral about purpose, modes of analysis which are equally usable to kill Vietnamese or build low-cost housing, make these students uncomfortable. They reason from recent history that systems analysis and the scientific method may be too well adapted to taking us rapidly and efficiently to where we won't want to be when we get there.

The students may not be wrong. Yet they face an impressive phalanx of opposition to their instinct that the vertical disciplines should be

stirred together in problem-solving, purpose-related combinations. The very structure of academia is against them. Access to academic journals, collegial admiration, and promotion and tenure are all to be had by toeing the disciplinary line. And the external critics are for once on the professors' side: the division of knowledge into watertight compartments enabled the alumni to develop self-esteem and a decent living, so why does the curriculum have to be controversial?

IV.

As the academy gropes for ways to broaden and deepen the student's college experience, without inflating the budget, its teachers and executives become aware of another dilemma sharpened by their attempt to do too many things with too little money. Collision No. 4 comes when the natural cosmopolitanism of the academy meets the natural parochialism of its parish.

"Are they teaching our kids to do something useful up there at the University, or are they trying to save the world?" On campus the two aims are not seen to conflict; but the articulate audience of taxpayers, givers, parents, alumni and professional, business and political leaders will generally give an absolute priority to (a) instruction (b) for local residents (c) for local service.

The comparative political popularity of community colleges compared to university campuses is traceable precisely to this natural prejudice: their students are seen as nearby residents, learning locally relevant skills on campuses devoted to teaching undefiled by "all those other things" that people seem to do in the more complex institutions.

In many States the public institutions have adopted strict limits on the numbers of out-of-State residents that can be admitted; most States now discriminate against out-of-State students by charging them higher tuition. Affirmative recruitment of non-resident students is increasingly frowned upon, though a really good athlete is still acceptable regardless of origin. (Localitis in student admissions is becoming harder to administer as the courts enforce the "equal treatment" clause of the U.S. Constitution. Eighteen-year-old adulthood has also made it easier for out-of-State students to emancipate themselves from faraway families and become "instant locals".)

In the early stages of a university's growth, its position in its community as emblem and engine of upward mobility can produce, as it has in Hawaii, an extraordinary willingness to invest in higher education. If they are seen as service to the parish, even expensive innovations become financeable. Despite an austerity budget which actually provides fewer dollars this year than last year for the whole University of Hawaii system, we are starting this Fall a new School of Law and a four-year School of Medicine. They survived the Draconian budget cuts because the State of Hawaii is seen to be still a colony of the U. S; Mainland until it can produce its own lawyers and doctors.

Second thoughts about population growth, in States such as Oregon and Hawaii, deepen the fears of in-migration. Young people who come to study on campus may remain to compete off-campus for jobs and housing, and add an unpredictable factor to the otherwise familiar equation of local politics. The fear is not focused Only on students. In the upward mobile communities especially -- Hawaii is again an example --

pressure grows to limit to local residents the recruitment of teachers, librarians, and administrators.

The collision of local with Federal purposes has been obscured for two decades by the great subsidies by which Washington has developed and pre-empted a generation of scientific talent to work on research oriented to national needs. As long as the subsidies kept coming, the university's parish could have pride in providing a home for great scientific instruments and creating ever larger programs of graduate instruction and research. But now that the Federal grants in many fields are drying up at the source, the maintenance of graduate excellence and the costs of using the accelerators and telescopes and oceanographic ships are increasingly matters for local decision.

The local parish's breadth of view, and length of vision, are especially tested when it comes to the academy's international role. In the 1950s and early 1960s, American colleges and universities were deeply and enthusiastically involved in defense research, foreign aid projects, and international cultural exchange. Overseas training programs, Study Abroad, the Experiment in International Living, and the Peace Corps all derived their strength from on-campus interest in international service. Institutions vied with each other to accept larger numbers of foreign students from a wider variety of nations. Before the University of Hawaii was a major institution in American terms, it was already a Mecca for students from Asia and the Pacific Islands, and the natural site for the Federally-financed East-West Center.

But in many institutions the international programs are languishing now. The long war in Vietnam, cumbersome foreign-aid procedures, the decline of student excitement about internationalism, the loss of interest by some big foundations, a reduced sympathy with economic development, and a growing preoccupation with urban and racial and ethical issues at home, all have been part of the change in mood. Federal policy has aggravated the trend: a few months after the visit of President Nixon to Peking, his budget analysts cut out support for teaching of Mandarin in American summer schools.

More than ever before, it is left to the local parish to decide whether it is worth while to play an international role. In Hawaii this choice is especially traumatic, for Hawaii's ethnic mix and geographical position has long made it the rhetorical "Hub of the Pacific". The rise of Japan, the opening of China, the prospect for negotiations in Korea, a precarious peace in Southeast Asia, and the burgeoning ambitions of the Pacific Islands, together with new technologies such as jumbo jets and communications satellites, all suggest a large and exciting international future for Hawaii's University. That prospect does not of course have to collide with "What are you doing for our kids?"; an international outlook is the natural orientation for an island institution. Yet the issue is still in doubt: after the University of Hawaii had spent three years building an educational satellite communication system that now connects most of the postsecondary colleges in the Pacific Islands, the austerity axe has fallen this year on the promising PEACESAT project.

V.

It is convenient to distinguish between what a college or university is supposed to do, and how it sets about to do it. The distinction can easily be overdrawn. Means and ends always interact. Yet the four collision courses already suggested do center in the purposes the academy sees itself or is seen as serving. The other three have to do with how those purposes are served, or even whether they can be served by an organization such as the modern American college or university is becoming.

What the academy teaches, to whom, for what purpose -- these are questions of lively public interst. The dilemmas are so interesting and higher education has become so expensive that concerned non-academic folk of many categories have been led to intervene deeply in the processes by which "academic" decisions are made. This sets up Collision No. 5, in which the outside insistence on "accountability" meets the academy's insistence on "campus independence".

Until very recently, there was a remarkably wide consensus - embracing governors and legislators, parents and alumni, employers and givers as well as trustees, students, faculty, and college executives -- that academic planning and budgeting were so indecipherably intellectual that they had to be left to the resident intellectuals. The aims were not in controversy: teaching was not yet seen to be in competition with research, the search for new knowledge was still seen as compatible with the sharing of existing knowledge with wide communities.

Academic planning in these circumstances was an exercise in uncosted visions. Typically, a faculty-administration committee assisted by a galaxy of task forces would compile a list of each unit's most defensible ambitions, and present them as a "plan" with the fiscal and physical implications to be worked out later and the timing also unclear. Proposals to build new buildings or fund new programs could then be justified by referring back to the Academic Development Plan.

The system worked well as long as resources were more plentiful than imagination. The general dimensions of the college or university could be controlled pretty well by selective admissions, and the search for new knowledge was generously funded by private foundations and the Federal Government. But "open access" broke open the budget, especially in the public institutions, and as the 1960s ran out, the Federal Government, most of the States, and the big foundations all decided, for related reasons, to be less open-handed in their support for college and university budgets.

Suddenly the privileged sanctuary of academic planning was invaded by demands to show cause why more students could not be taught, why classrooms and faculty offices could not be occupied more hours of the day, why some subjects needed to be taught at all. Federal agencies, inhibited for decades past by the concept of academic freedom, found that they could ask accountability questions without violating anyone's constitutional rights. Quite suddenly, the academy had to devise new systems to quantify and computerize its self-perceptions, cast up the costs and benefits of proposed new programs, expose its policy choices

to the general public, and apply to itself those techniques of program evaluation and systems analysis which had previously been taught only to students learning to manage organizations other than colleges and universities.

Aggression across the academic frontier has been hastened by the search for off-campus relevance by the academics themselves. As members of the academy rode out to expose the polluters, advocate more community planning, stop the war and keep the government honest, they released the reciprocal energies of community leaders who saw some wrongs to be righted in the academy too. Campus disruptions also reduced the respect for "campus independence"; outsiders could clearly see how fragile the on-campus consensus, and how vulnerable the institutions of self-government, were turning out to be.

The more the outsiders learn about college and university management, the more excuses they find to intervene in it. Even a decade ago, it was widely accepted that professors were special people whose working conditions could not be measured by the forty-hour week or the twelve-month calendar. Obviously the time spent in class was no more significant in judging how hard a scholar-teacher was working than the time spent in court or the operating room in measuring the effort of a lawyer or a surgeon. But suddenly the obvious is no longer so evident. As faculty workload practices come to be compared in public controversy with the way other kinds of people work and are paid, the academy's critics find much to criticize in a system which seems to define success as teaching less for more pay.

The controversy about faculty workload is not, as some of the academy's defenders claimed at first, the result of massive public misunderstanding of how a professor lives and works (the citizen,

informed that a professor's teaching commitment is nine credit-hours, saying, "Well, that's a pretty good day's work".). It is an historically inevitable consequence of the academy's explosive growth --no longer a smallish community of scholars, now a large multi-purpose organization with only a minority of its professional staff seriously engaged in scholarship, and a majority inclined to regard themselves as employees of the academy rather than as part of its management. In these circumstances, practices that would have seemed grotesque in any previous generation develop a momentum of their own: detailed written rules about wages, hours and working conditions, collective bargaining about sabbatical leave and overload teaching, legislative intervention in curriculum changes and academic appointments.

The felt need to rationalize open-ended academic planning with finite resource constraints has spurred the States to pull together in State-wide systems the planning and coordination of each jurisdiction's colleges and universities, public and private. Half of the 50 States have adopted, or are soon to adopt, a setup like that in Hawaii, where a single governing board is responsible for all of public higher education. In the other States, tight coordination of all academic programs and institutional budgets is in force or in prospect. In the Education Amendments of 1972, the U. S. Congress has urged each State to have a Commission on Postsecondary Education embracing not only the public systems but private and parochial colleges, industrial training programs, and profit-seeking proprietary schools.

The scrutiny of outsiders is here to stay; college faculties and administrations can no longer expect to operate on free funds; campus

independence is permanently compromised by accountability. But for public colleges and universities, the new layer of State-wide planners may help to avert direct collisions between campuses and political/financial decision-makers. The new division of labor can be that campuses (executives and faculty members, with some student participation) retain substantial autonomy in deciding what is taught and researched, but fit into a wider planning-budgeting system when it comes to deciding how much their plans can cost in all. Collective bargaining, between State-wide unions and the State government, will tend to standardize salaries and workload measures and some other conditions of employment, but it is obviously important in preserving campus independence for State government and State-wide unions not to reach over into the substance of instruction and research.

VI.

It is common observation that each of the academy's immediate constituents -- students, faculty members, staff, administrators, alumni, and contributors -- shares the conviction that its members' rights may be neglected unless they organize to remind the academy about them. Believing, with Mr. Justice Holmes, that "liberty is secreted in the interstices of procedure," the constituents are more and more inclined to get the academy's processes written down on paper. Collision No. 6 is <u>the tendency of rights to produce rigidities</u>.[1]

---

[1]An earlier formulation of this theme appeared in "The Muscle Bound Academy", a 1972 address to the Association of College and University Attorneys.

Thus it is (at the University of Hawaii, for example) that the academic faculty has voted to organize and bargain collectively with the University -- which an earlier generation of professors would have defined as consisting essentially of themselves. Some academic departments, not usually the best ones, have even taken to recording formal votes and conducting curriculum discussions by Robert's Rules of Order. The judgment whether several young professors would be recommended for tenure turned, in one departmental hassle, on whether the 1895 or the 1912 edition of Robert's Rules should prevail.

A growing proportion of all academic people who don't get what they want go to court about it. As this is written, I am a defendant in a dozen lawsuits, either as University President or as an individual, usually both. The plaintiffs include a student who received a C and is suing for a B in a business administration course, faculty members who charge that adverse judgments on their new or continued employment were based on their sex or race, a professor who does not wish to retire at the mandatory retirement age, and a parent who thinks that policies for admission for our laboratory school, an elementary and secondary school managed for experimental purposes by the University's College of Education, should be subjected to the full range of rule-making process described by the Hawaii Administrative Procedure Act.

Some of this activity may result from what one colleague calls "social ambulance chasing"; that is, lawyers collect plaintiffs and sponsor class actions to claim violation of newly popular constitutional rights, taking the cases on contingent fees that need not be paid unless

the case is won, or the State can be induced to settle out of court. But, though there may be some temptations along this line as the no-fault principle dries up the negligence business, most such suits reflect honest feelings of ravished rights in a litigious age.

As students come to consider themselves not as objects but as subjects of higher education, they too organize to insist on formal processes and written regulations. Student government and student activity boards, which now control very large resources in some institutions, are resorting to incorporation to protect their independent discretion. Disciplinary action resulting from conduct damaging to the institution is now unthinkable unless the college or university has, in the Scranton Commission's language, "promulgate/d/ a code making clear the limits of permissible conduct and announce/d/ in advance what measures it is willing to employ in response to impermissible conduct". Even so, sanctions for bad behavior will be challenged unless they have been defined after formal notice, publication of written rules, a waiting period, and public hearings, and the rules contain provision for public charges, peer judgments, confrontation of accusers, right of counsel, appeal to higher authority and eventually to the courts.

The growing dedication to formal legal process is infectious. If faculty members elect a union to write down all their rights in a contract, the non-faculty staff and the graduate assistants will not be far behind; in Wisconsin, indeed, graduate assistants broke the ice and organized first. The duer the process, the more legal talent the institution and each of its constituencies will require. Nor will austerity cut the legal staffs. The less money there is for higher education, the more people will consult lawyers to learn how the Constitution and the courts can help them get their fair share.

Something very important is happening here. Society has assigned a unique role to colleges and universities -- a role which requires a maximum of self-governance. Yet the whole idea that colleges and universities are competent to govern themselves, to protect the rights and enforce the obligations of their members, is now in question.

What is questioned is a hardy chunk of conventional wisdom, the product of several hundred years of academic development. It is a trio of notions: that in a company of intellectuals, precise rules of behavior are nonsense; that valid judgments about rights and responsibilties within the academy can be made only by peers, individual members of the academic club are free to inquire, to think, to teach, and to speak out in a socially-protected sanctuary -- and to do it for life.

In earlier times the need for this special protection was apparent. The academy was society's prime change-agent. If every inquiry into the unknown, every teaching of the unusual, every advocacy of the unpopular was to be branded as heresy or treason, the promise of the Age of Reason could never be realized and the Enlightenment would be but a brief interlude between one Dark Age and another.

The academy is still among society's prime change-agents. But the protection is being stripped away. The reasons derive directly from the insistence of the many that the academy not remain an enclave of the few. Higher education now does hundreds of things besides search the truth and try to interest students in thinking about it. Colleges and universities perform, that is to say, many functions which neither require nor deserve the special protection of a social sanctuary.

The blurring of the line between academy and community has even withered the notion that education has to take place on a campus; the many dry runs for "open universities" and "external degrees' bear witness. College and university administration has extended far beyond the effort to achieve a collegial consensus within an academic community, to embrace lobbying with legislatures and political executives, and trying to influence taxpayers, private givers, philanthropists and contracting officers. Many university people are really extensions of a government agency, not searching for basic knowledge but enabling the sponsoring agency to get something done without breaking through its manpower ceiling. A growing proportion of campus decision-making is handled off-campus, by trustees, state coordinators, private benefactors, political leaders, the courts, the Congress, and the Federal Office of Management and Budget.

The dependence of insiders on relations with outsiders is bound to fragment the institution's solidarity and reduce its comparative hold on the loyalty of its individual members. One consequence is a preoccupation inside the academy with rights at the expense of responsibilities. In the past four years I have greeted dozens of Federal visitors mandated to protect the rights of special categories of University people. They almost never ask whether the persons in the protected categories are performing effectively in their assigned functions. Small wonder: where rights are routinely appealed <u>from</u> the academy, responsibilities <u>to</u> the academy are bound to get lost in the shuffle.

VII.

The belated arrival of the U.S. Consititution on the American campus,

which dates only from the early 1960s, has opened the doors of decision-making to many groups that were excluded before. One result is Collision No. 7. From the college executive's angle of vision, the new question is: How do you get everybody in on the act and still get some action?

The dilemma is not unique to the academy. Throughout our society, the puzzle is how to reconcile the growing demand for public participation in important decisions with the need to get the decisons made. It is easy to consult forever, producing a warm feeling by never deciding against any of the participators. It is also possible to act without consultation, but the result may also be a non-action, as the decision comes to be nullified by opposition strengthened by the argument that the opponents were not asked for their opinion ahead of time.

The argument for consulting the affected groups before acting to affect them does not rest merely on the need to head off predictable opposition. Most decisions in modern society are so complicated that the responsible executive cannot possibly predict all the consequences of his actions. The main value of advance consultation is that it improves the quality of decisions by the person (or nation[2]) who consults. But there is no dependable formula to guide the consulter, except perhaps that antique and useful principle, the Golden Rule: If someone else were to do to you what you are about to do to him, would you think he

---

[2]A general theory of international consultation, much of which is also applicable in relations among individuals or small groups, is suggested in my NATO: The Transatlantic Bargain, (New York; Harper & Row, 1970), Chapters 1 and 2.

should consult you first?

The danger was always there that wider participation would make for more sluggish decision-making; one can only hope that the higher quality of decisions makes up for the delay. A less obvious danger in participatory modes of action is that most people prefer the known to the unknown, and resist any change that is not of clear and present benefit to them. One of the political ironies of our era is that the openness of decision-making routinely advocated by radicals inhibits the radical changes they espouse. With most groups on most subjects, consultation tends to confirm, not modify, existing rules or practices. If every educational innovation required a wide consensus in advance, colleges and universities would be even less experimental than they are.

* * *

As the traffic becomes more viscous along the arteries of higher education, and pile-upsmultiply in the great intersection, will it all grind to a halt? Probably not; even in Paris's Etoile and in midtown Manhattan, the vehicles somehow eventually get through. But it is more likely that Americans in search of exciting instruction, new knowledge and better solutions to their social frustrations will look harder for alternate routes.

Bureaucratic rigidity and participatory resistance to change may in time limit the social utility of colleges and universities. Today many students, faculty and staff members, not to mention contractors, foundations, business firms and government agencies, still find the academy

useful because it has the flexibility to accommodate their ambitions and encourage social change. Many members of the academy, those who pay and those who are paid, are there because somebody had the discretion to make some exception to some traditional but fortunately unwritten practice. But if the practices are all to be committed to paper, codified in laws and executive orders and Board decisions and collective bargaining agreements and student contracts, none of which can be changed without lengthy processes or bypassed without lawsuits, the resuling hardening of the arteries can only be devastating for the academy's role as the incubator of social invention.

American civilization is probably resilient enough to survive the arteriosclerosis of its academies. Government agencies, industrial training schools, and centers for integrative research and advanced thinking have already invaded the traditional preserve of "higher education". Acceleration of these trends could take up some of the lack lost by muscle-binding the traditional colleges and universities.

But the best antidote would be not to accept what Jimmy Durante called "da conditions dat prevail", and reverse the trends here described. That will require self-restraint on the part of the outside intervenors, and a return to collegiality among the faculty, campus administrators, and system planners. That is almost a prescription for a change in human nature. But the stakes are high enough to make it worth a try.

EFFICIENCY, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND THE COLLEGE EXECUTIVE

Joseph F. Kauffman

I am pleased to have this opportunity of addressing the Conference in Higher Education and to be back in New England.

For those practitioners who look askance at Professors in the field of administration of higher education I do want to make clear that I was serving in my fifth year as President of Rhode Island College when Dr. Anello issued his invitation to me. When I wrote to him of my impending change of status, from President to Professor, I gave him a chance to withdraw the invitation. It occurred to me, in these days of tight budgets, that the travel expense from Madison, Wisconsin, being somewhat greater than that from Providence, Rhode Island, might ruin his conference budget. Yet he was gracious enough to decline my offer. Incidentally, having served as an Assistant to the President and as a Dean of Students, I must say that one ought to be either a President or a Professor! But that may be a sign of my advancing age!

It is also a source of great pleasure for me to be able to participate in a program with Harlan Cleveland, a man whom I have admired for many years. Dr. Cleveland's contributions as Dean of the Maxwell School at Syracuse University, and as Assistant Secretary of State are well known to me. I also had the privilege of serving in Washington, D. C. during the Kennedy era and I know of his achievements in serving our country. His essays on public administration in his book, The Future Executive (1971), evidently inspired the theme of this conference and I commend them to you for your study. (Anyone who, in these times of budget retrenchment, can obtain legislative approval and appropriations for a new Medical School and a new Law School, at the same time, must know something we can all learn.)

One of the dangers in examining a subject such as the College Executive is that we may find such an analysis discouraging. I am reminded of Henrik Ibsen's Peer Gynt and the scene (Act V, scene 5) which uses an onion as a symbol of what I mean. Peer Gynt starts peeling an onion, layer by layer, analyzing himself and his past as he peels off each layer--until finally he discovers, at the end, that there is no kernel, just layers, smaller and smaller--then nothing!

As we look at the rapidly growing literature on college and university administration, and as we look at the future, it is wise to keep some perspective. Not everyone is enamored of the "managerial revolution" and some viewed our advance with grim foreboding. The theme of my remarks can be illustrated by quoting from a letter that Prof. William James sent to Harvard President Charles W. Eliot back in 1891:

> "My impression is that in the extraordinary scrupulousness and conscientiousness with which our academic machine is being organized now, we run the risk of overwhelming the lives of men whose interest is more in learning than in administration." (quoted in Lawrence R. Veysey, The Emergence of the American University. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.)

Many of us are not really interested in "management" as such. We are interested in the effectiveness of a particular enterprise known as a college or university. We know that efficiency, good management, and the wise use of our resources are essential in order to further the purposes of our institutions. We might not give the same personal fidelity to the management of some other kinds of enterprises whose purposes were different or, in our terms, less socially useful. So it is the enterprise

itself, and its goals and objectives we seek to further; and efficiency and sound management are means, not ends.

One of the problems we face in adapting the language of business management to higher education is the unique nature of our enterprise. How does one estimate the economic value of study and reflection? How does one compute the cost effectiveness of a course in Greek mythology? Steve Bailey in a brilliant article on the limits of accountability (AGB Reports, May/June 1973) points out that such a course will probably be dropped because of low enrollments. He goes on to say: "But it is just possible that if one or two statesmen had read about Promethean hubris prior to our excursions in Vietnam, the world might have been spared ten or twenty years of the anger of the gods."

Bailey, in the same article, recalls a famous University of Wisconsin story about President Glenn Frank, back in the 1930's. When a rural member of the Wisconsin legislature showed signs of shock in hearing that University faculty taught only nine hours per week, President Frank responded, "Sir, you are famous for your stud bulls. Would you judge their value by the number of hours a week they work?"

Other than credit hours or degrees, it is difficult to quantify what we produce in our colleges and universities. The relationship of a professor to each student, is an individual matter and differs for each professor and each student. How each interacts with the material under study is equally complex. The costs of their endeavors can be computed and described. We are not so sure we can measure the benefits, except perhaps over a lifetime and in the context of a specific community. And the quality of the personal relationship between teacher and student may not lend itself to measurement in any accounting sense.

The nature of "production" in a college or university is unique. The faculty is the primary authority on much of the business. Management must, therefore, accept as part of its task, the enhancement of the personal freedom and autonomy of individual faculty in order that quality production can take place.

There is no one style or form of management that is appropriate for all of the activities and programs within a complex institution. The old maxim, "that government is best which governs least" may be most appropriate for a research and development center. Yet it would be totally inadequate as the philosophy governing the operation of a college food service or for dealing with campus parking problems.

Policy decisions should be made with everyone aware of the administrative or management implications of such decisions, including cost factors. Yet policy should not be made solely on the basis of such considerations. Management implements decisions, yet we are still faced with the problem of deciding on purposes and objectives and for these, management and leadership may not be congruent. Permit me to identify several of the substantive issues or problems which college executives have to face today. I do this to illuminate the nature of the challenges we all must confront. Each of these issues calls for leadership as well as sound management.

1. <u>The Financial Crisis.</u>

In an era of onward and upward growth such as the decade of the 1960s represented, college and university administrators took for granted their ability to obtain the resources to implement decisions. Despite inflation, it was a period of relative prosperity in terms of both

Federal and State support. Appropriations of state tax funds for public higher education over the ten year period 1959-60 to 1969-70 rose an average of 337½%.** The range of increases ran from a low of 124½% for South Dakota to 742½% in Hawaii. There were a number of states in which appropriations for higher education increased by 500% or more during the decade: Connecticut, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina and Rhode Island.

The "new depression" currently facing higher education is, therefore, coming at the end of unparalleled growth and support. It requires an adjustment that for some is traumatic. Despite continuing inflation, institutions are being required to do the same, or more, on less "real" dollars. Difficult decisions are being required, including program review, the setting of priorities and the elimination of practices which had become taken for granted. This has created pain and conflict. Administrators have had to play new roles, make decisions which have real consequences in people's lives and it appears to me that this condition will continue for several more years.

The Federal Government is rapidly phasing out its programs of support for physical facilities, "capitation" grants in some of the professions in which only recently it spurred

** These appropriation data are taken from M. ... Chambers, Higher Education in the Fifty States, Danville, Illinois: Interstate Publishers, 1970.

rapid growth, e. g., nursing, graduate training fellowships and other areas of support. Further, it is altering its philosophy in the area of student financial support, generally, seeking to make such support directly to students rather than to institutions. This is a fundamental change which represents the Administration's "free market" philosophy.

2. Another issue is the escalation of State Coordination and Control.

While this concerns the public institutions primarily, we are warned by Lyman A. Glenny and others that the nonpublic institutions are also increasingly subject to external leadership as they become more dependent on various forms of tax assistance.

Two trends relating to the activity of states in public higher education have occurred since 1950. The first of these is the development of formal "coordinating boards" for higher education, exercising considerable external control over program growth, overall expenditures and planning. The second trend has been the consolidation of control of public institutions under single governing boards.

Only four states out of the fifty remain without some form of governing or coordinating board for all public higher education (Alabama, Delaware, Nebraska and Vermont.) Most recently there have been attempts to put all education, from pre-school through graduate school under a single board. Rhode Island is a good (or bad) example of this movement.

Institutional individualism, crucial to faculty control and power, is now giving way to state systems and centralized state administrations--a new layer with which administrators and faculties have to contend in the decision-making process. This may create some new positions in the field of administration and management, but it also requires major adjustments in the conventional tasks of campus administrators.

There are obvious advantages to overall coordination and planning. My remarks are concerned primarily with problems to be faced and challenges to be met and I must, therefore, emphasize the difficulties which such boards introduce in the frequently ambiguous role of administrative leadership on a single campus. In this regard, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education* recently warned:

> "Colleges and universities that enjoy the support and protection of the state also need, on occasion, to be protected from intrusion by the state into academic and other matters that should be the province of the institutions."

The Commission went on to recommend some ways to reduce the possibility of conflict in this sensitive area.

It is sufficient to say that the centralization of decision-making in public higher education runs counter to a long tradition of campus autonomy and decentralized authority in

* The Capitol and the Campus, Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1971.

American institutions. The adjustments required include administrative skills and techniques ranging from cost-effectiveness concepts to human relations. All of this has import for practitioners and for those being prepared for administrative careers in higher education--at whatever locus in the structures.

3. External Pressures for Changes in Functions.

I am using the word "external" here because it has been both my understanding and my observation that most of the changes in direction within our institutions come about from direct or indirect external pressures. By external, I mean outside of the faculty and its self-governance organizational structure. I say this not as a criticism, however, for I am in sympathy with the observation of Sir Eric Ashby that the "inertia" of the system is a "virtue, for systems do need some stability and the forces of customer demand, manpower needs, and patron's influence can be very capricious."*

Three illustrations are presented here, although there are others as well. "Open-admissions" is one example, although in some states such a function is restricted to the two-year community college. Nevertheless, the public policy goal of universal access to higher education has major implications for the function of the entire enterprise.

All of this relates to the second example which is

*Quoted from Chronicle of Higher Education, October 2, 1972, p. 8.

career-education, or vocational education, or as I would describe it, justifying mass public higher education in terms of meeting our manpower needs. There have always been external pressures to train youth for the job market, to prepare and certify people for vocations and professions in which the community, state or Federal government had an interest. The vast expansion of higher education in the past three decades stems from that. In adapting to that function we have forgotten that as the job market changes and manpower needs are redefined, there is a public expectation that higher education will automatically adapt itself as well. This is not so easily accomplished, as we all know.

Being expected to function as port of entry for all youth, regardless of their interest or commitment to intellectual development; and being expected to "tool-up" or "bank-down" the machinery for the job market and fluctuating manpower needs, has taught us to be more modest in our claims. New functions call for new flexibilities and new accountability. We are now trying to adjust to these new expectations.

My third example is in the area of non-traditional study, which is a complex topic in and of itself. The National Commission on Non-Traditional Study, headed by Samuel B. Gould, has recently reported on the results of its studies and made a series of 58 recommendations in connection with this topic.*

*Although the Commission is publishing its report, available through the Educational Testing Service, a digest of the findings may be found in The Chronicle of Higher Education, Feb. 5, 1973, pp. 6 & 7.

Essentially, colleges and universities are being told that their growing functions need to include a greater concern for the study needs of adults. They are being told to adapt their practices to meet such needs. They are being told that they need to counter the "degree-earning obsession" by offering services to interested learners outside the formal structure of the campus and traditional teaching-learning methods.

There is no question in my mind that higher education will be expected to meet the expectations for non-traditional study. This will require further adaptations in the conventional patterns of both instruction and administration on our campuses.

4. A Diminution of Faculty Authority and Institutional Autonomy

I have stated earlier that campus individualism, crucial to faculty authority, is now giving way to state systems. As long as so many tax dollars are demanded for education, this tide will not be reversed. No longer having to plan for expansion, centralized administrations have inherited the tasks of imposing controls and developing measures to justify current appropriation requests. When costs have to be trimmed, it is the central administration which is given the task.

Governors, budget offices and legislatures press such administrators for answers to questions on teaching loads, costs per student, objectives of each program, "trade-offs" for new programs requested, and results of assessments of

programs and their cost-effectiveness. All of this results in a heightening of the management role and a diminution of the traditional role of faculty authority. The distance between faculty and consolidated board has also been lengthened in the process.

Out of this has come the advent of collective bargaining and unionization of faculty. The role of college or university administrator, when an adversary relationship between faculty and administration has been institutionalized, is obviously different from that role in a collegial type of governance. Third parties have to be brought into labor disputes and the campus already has too many external influences shaping it.

Whatever one's personal views on these developments, administrators have to be prepared for more structured relationships and to adapt to new realities without losing sight of basic goals. I do not fear the collective bargaining movement. But it will demand alterations in our tasks.

5. Enrollments.

This topic is a matter of concern insofar as it has enormous implications for funding of most public colleges and universities. In a period of significant growth, dollars followed FTE students, and properly so. As student enrollment levels off, so does funding, and inflationary costs require reductions in operations. When enrollments decline, those campuses on an FTE formula are faced with both program

and personnel reductions. The problems are obvious.

The Carnegie Commission, and others, predict that absolute numbers will actually decline in the 1980s. The rapid growth of the past two decades is evidently coming to an end.

Since the end of the draft and the "winding down" of the war in Vietnam, college attendance by young white males--ages 18 and 19--has fallen significantly. Recent census data showed that among 18 and 19-year-old white men, 47.3 percent were in college in 1969 while last fall, 1972, only 39.6 percent were enrolled. (College enrollment among Black youth continues to rise.)

Shifts in enrollment, from liberal arts to vocational and technical curricula are also reported. These are related to the tight job market and the difficulties of the B.A. generalist in finding employment.

Obviously, college and university administrations are being pressed for creative responses to this problem. Structural adjustments will have to be made to adapt to a "zero-enrollment growth" condition.

This will be especially difficult if inflationary costs continue their upward spiral. But it will also result in much more competition for students among campuses, and that has both healthy and unhealthy prospects requiring far more time to analyze than I can give this subject here.

6. Oversupply of Ph.D's (Relation to Tenure).

When Allan Cartter* warned us, back in 1966, that we were

*Allan Cartter, "The Supply and Demand of College Teachers," Journal of

producing Ph.D's at a far greater rate than could be absorbed on college and university faculties, it was considered heresy. Today, the so-called "glut" of Ph.D's on the market is the most orthodox of statements.

To be sure, present trends in the job market for Ph.D's are drawing off prospective Ph.D. students into such fields as law and medicine. In addition, some recent surveys have indicated that the proportion of undergraduates planning to go on to graduate work has dropped substantially in the past few years.** Several universities, including Harvard and Stanford have announced that they are curtailing enrollments in graduate programs over the next few years. The Modern Language Association has called for reduced enrollments in Ph.D. programs in English and the foreign languages.***

Nevertheless, a combination of leveling-off of undergraduate enrollments, and severe financial problems of most institutions, will continue to cause serious problems for faculties and administrators. After a period of continuous, spiraling growth, it is difficult to adjust to a problem of faculty oversupply, faculty retrenchment, and challenges to the "up or out" tradition of tenure which flow from new strictures

Human Resources, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Summer, 1966, pp. 22-38; and "Future Faculty Needs and Resources", in Calvin Lee, ed., Improving College Teaching (American Council on Education, 1966), pp. 99-121.

**New Students and New Places, Carnegie Commission on Higher Education published by McGraw-Hill, 1971, p. 58.

***as reported in The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 26, 1970.

on tenure appointments.

One can add to the discussion of this problem the pressures for increased cost-effectiveness which regards raising the student/faculty ratio as a sign of increased productivity. And this has been happening. Recently, the Management Division of the Academy for Educational Development produced a widely circulated publication entitled "Higher Education With Fewer Teachers". (October, 1972). It contained several examples of institutions where student/faculty ratios of 20 to 1 were operating "adequately" (as against a national average of 13.5 to 1). It also described the ways in which such ratios could be raised for greater efficiency.*

Although tenure is a separate subject, as is academic freedom, it must also be mentioned in the context of this subject. The oversupply of Ph.D's and the leveling off of enrollments coincide with increasing attacks on the tenure system. It has been charged that tenure is awarded too easily, if not automatically, in most institutions and that once given it provides unwarranted protection to unproductive teachers. Administrators and boards of trustees, aware that institutional growth is ending, have sought ways to limit the proportion of faculty on tenure.

*To be fair, the Academy will not advocate that this be done but provided examples of actual practices for the consideration of college and university administrators.

During 1971-72, a study of tenure was conducted, co-sponsored by the Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors, with a grant from the Ford Foundation. While the report reaffirms the essential validity of tenure and its relation to academic freedom, it makes a total of 47 detailed recommendations on the subject, including one calling for a quota on the proportion of tenured faculty any campus permits. The recommended quota or ceiling would limit tenure to a range of one-half to two-thirds of the total faculty. They do not say how do do this!

Given the fact that the AAUP/AAC Commission's study also revealed that at most institutions more than 80% of the faculty members being considered for tenure in 1971 were awarded it, with 42% of the institutions granting it to all candidates; and given the fact that the Commission also recommends "a substantial increase in the tenure component of women and minority groups", it should be obvious that academic administrators face a terribly difficult problem with this issue.

Now these problems are sufficient to challenge any college executive and we should be prepared to utilize all of the management science tools available to cope with them. Yet, I think you will agree that these matters go to the heart of public policy and the quality of life in our society and they cannot be dealt with merely by imposing tough business management procedures upon them.

The university has been denigrated in some ways by characterizations of it as "knowledge-industry", "academic supermarket" and less affectionate ascriptions. Having accepted massive amounts of public dollars makes the university accountable in a way which some have likened to a public utility. There is some legitimacy to demands that it be consumer-oriented, productivity-conscious and output-oriented. Yet we know it is more complex than that.

Most of us know college administration as an art, rather than a science. Yet, to be responsible and effective we cannot be ignorant of management language, concepts or tools. A college executive today, must know the capabilities of the computer, the techniques of management by objectives and the methods of program budgeting and systems analysis. We know, all to well, that the resources available to us are finite indeed and that waste of such resources is plainly intolerable.

Yet we also know that we have always been accountable,long before that term became a cliche. Most dictionaries define that word as "liable to be called to account" and we know that administrators have always been "called to account" by students, faculty, boards, alumni and the public.

My greatest fear is that we will not be called to account for what higher education ought to become. For it has been my own personal experience that while I have been asked innumerable times about space utilization, salaries, numbers of employees, regulations concerning discipline, administrative costs and other budget details, in my years as a college executive, I was never asked how things were going in the classroom. I was never asked how <u>learning</u> was going! I was never asked about the intellectual development of students or faculty.

In the press to adopt the fads of management techniques (many of which have been severely criticized by industry and experts in business administration) we may blunt further the limited leadership, all too timid now, which we so urgently need to face the future.

If we surrender to the pressure to define our objectives solely in terms of immediately measurable goals, and if we put a "freeze" on present practices, then we are part of the problem, not part of the solution. For I believe that human freedom is inextricably tied to the purposes of higher education. And one cannot place a dollar value on that!

One function of higher education is to encourage the development of imagination and creativity--to celebrate the potential of the human spirit, if you will. Higher education not only creates and transmits the knowledge and technical competence which enables us to cope with our complex world; it also has the potential, if not the responsibility, to convey that life itself is worthwhile so that we will be committed to wanting to cope. What we teach and what we learn relates to such concerns and to the human condition itself. We must not be afraid to deal with such questions, even if they do not lend themselves to either empirical research methodology or accounting techniques.

Despite the ambiguity of criteria for measuring the success of college executives, I hope you will agree with me that along with maintaining order, balancing the budget, and solving the parking problem, there will have to be included some items which show our resistance to those forces which shrivel the human spirit.

College executives of the future must be held accountable for that!

ADMINISTRATION FOR WHAT FOR WHOM ?

Jacquelyn Anderson Mattfeld

As a nation we have a short attention span. By now, nobody over thirty is really surprised when the principles of the pendulum or the cycle are discovered to be still operative in human affairs, and nobody is much inclined to make a case for progress just because motion is evident. The last two decades have shown that this ad-hocratic society produces fashions that come and go, even in the academic sector. One has only to compare, over any two or three year period, the topics addressed in the national journals and meetings of professional educators with those of any local campus student newspaper to see how instantly universal, and how frequently short-lived, our institution's immediate concerns and problems have been. It seemed for a time that the impetus for change - the shape of things to come in colleges and universities - would arise primarily from a vocal and activist minority of undergraduates and their likeminded faculty. These were the spokesmen for all who shared a desire to break the bonds of traditional authority in the academic community and to establish in its place individual liberty and/or "participatory democracy," not only in governance but also in academic areas such as curriculum, grading, and degree requirements. Many faculty, and some officers, though far from convinced that the advocated curricular changes were reforms, allowed themselves to be carried along on the flood of revolt in 1968-[illegible] and 69-70, but from the safe vantage of 1973 now openly admit they were simply waiting out the storm. "If you don't like the latest student moods and movements, wait a minute," paraphrased one resigned Samuel Clemens authority. In institutions where faculty committees or student-faculty committees proliferated during the tense years, faculty members differed in the degree

of their acceptance or reluctance to include students, but large numbers, especially in the non-tenured ranks, were glad enough to see in the committees a challenge to the administrative structure from which they had felt excluded, or to whose real or presumed power they secretly aspired. Though disquieting, the pressures for change in policies as they affected undergraduate education and in governances as they applied to an entire institution did not really threaten the primacy of research activities and graduate programs, or light teaching loads - those aspects of college and university life in which faculty have the highest stake. But the most recent forces acting upon institutions of higher learning do. The students, faculty, administrators, as well as the research and educational activities and social contributions of the college, are all under fire from every sector of the citizenry, and that dissatisfaction is reflected in a variety of ways that touch faculty priorities directly. Both governmental agencies and private foundations, chief outside sources of funding, have withdrawn much of the funding formerly poured into faculty research, and graduate student fellowships and assistantships. They charge institutions of higher learning with inability to operate without deficits, and with unwillingness to address the society's perceived needs more directly. Boards of trustees, often equally critical though representative of a different sector of society, now appoint new executive officers in the schools for which they are responsible with the mandate to them to balance the books and reestablish order and authority within their schools. The tolerance for heterogeneity of values and multiplicity of institutional functions that characterized higher education in its goldplated expansionist third-quarter of this century has run head on into the stone-wall of intractable

financial constraint. The new password in the inner circle of our profession is "Priorities," and the latest concern of those who sit in the high seats is how to clarify and then articulate their individual institution's objectives, so that some ordering can be made against which to test the inevitable choices. In the resultant impasse beleaguered college executives are asking whose plans, whose policies, and whose regulations we are to carry out, and whether indeed they and their officers still possess the authority necessary to administer at all. The fact that the titles selected for the group discussions and the topics of all but the first speech in this conference have more to do with the problems that beset the present administrator than with conjecture about the future college executive makes clear just how central these concerns are to those of us whose profession is administration.

Effective leadership is only possible when a group of individuals is united either against a common foe or toward a common goal. Good administration is effective only when those who make policy and set forth regulations have the respect and assent of those who will be governed by them, and when in turn those who are selected to articulate and enforce the decisions have the confidence of both those governing. The contemporary college executive is handicapped in most institutions by the absence of all or most of these necessary conditions. So far the spectre of possible financial collapse and the barrage of public approbrium have not been sufficient to rally the constituents of most schools to a sense of common outrage and unity. In the universities there is no concurrence within and single constituency, let alone among the five major constituencies, students, faculty, administrators, alumnae, trustees, as to the relative importance of the four generally acknowledged purposes of a university: the advancement of man's knowledge,

the identification and training of scholars, the liberal and preprofessional education of candidates for bachelors degrees, and service to the local community and the larger society. In colleges, both independent colleges and university colleges, administrators and faculty, and often alumnae and trustees, differ radically among themselves about whom the schools should educate: what the degree should represent: whether breadth and depth should continue as the governing principles of undergraduate education: whether it is indeed the publishing scholar and scientist who provide the best teaching for gifted undergraduates in search of a general education; what constitutes appropriate service of a college to its community, and whether, or to what extent, traditional stances of any given institution should be modified to reflect the changing needs and demands of the nation for higher education. The absence of any areas of general agreement on these most fundamental issues raises the question of who can speak for the institution, who can authoritatively declare whom the school is to serve and how, who has the right and the responsibility to make short-range and long-range plans, and by what means decisions are to be reached.

It is not only the plurality of opinions among faculty, students, administrators, alumnae and trustees that makes leadership so difficult today. It is the enormous failure in confidence and in genuine dialogue. As colleges and universities have moved from regarding themselves as collegial, intellectual communities to seeing themselves as microcosmic political states a pervasive paranoia has spread among the members. Increasing diversity of socioeconomic background, race, creed, and sex of students, and to some extent of faculty, has brought with it new vitality but also competing interests, needs and frustrations. The

entrenched, no less than the newcomers, are made uneasy by the "otherness" of their peers and each group feels threatened by the other. There is also distrust and disillusionment for which it is harder to account - between administrators and faculty, between students and faculty, students and administrators, and among administrators and trustees, Suspicion and lack of generosity increasingly mar the relationships of those within each group. At the executive level the introduction of certain principles borrowed from modern business management appears to have further eroded the possibilities for goodwill, credibility and cooperation by emphasizing beliefs no less susceptible to distortion and caricature - viz. That competition within the ranks is "healthy," that tension is "creative," that "process" rather than decision-making is the best means of forward motion, and "efficiency" the ultimate good.

The difficulties created by our lack of common vision about what is to be administered - about the nature and functions of an institution of higher learning - and for whom the institution and hence the administration, exists are further compounded by the presence on many campuses of two systems of governance imperfectly meshed and basically antagonistic, they are also exacerbated by the enforced mobility of administrators especially at the highest levels. The frequent changes of personnel in the top administration and, the absence of a single view of an institution's functions that results, have both led to further weakening of administrative leadership and effectiveness.

Fifteen or twenty years ago the world was simpler, and colleges shared in that simplicity. The chief officers of an institution were likely to remain in their position fifteen or more years, and second and even third eschalon administratives were their appointers and tended to

exhibit the personal traits and image of the institution and its goods held by those at the top. The widespread acceptance of hierarchical structure and of the homogeneity of the population found within any given institution made governance a relatively uncomplicated matter. It was easy to identify the desk where the "buck" stopped. The lines of authority coincided with delegated responsibility and budget control at each level of administration. An officer of an institution knew who had made the policies he was to enforce, how much discretion and independent judgment he was permitted in interpreting and executing those policies, and the procedure to be followed to initiate change when he or someone else decreed that to be desirable. He could also expect that in general the minority who had not supported a decision or policy would feel obligated to live by it once it had been passed by a majority and approved by those with final authority. This is no longer true.

Today, for example, in many places it is common to discover that the instructional budget and approval of appointments continue in the hands of the chief academic officer and the department chairmen, while an elaborate system of elected faculty committees is charged with the task of approving educational policy, curriculum, and degree requirements, and a group of second level administrators is instructed to oversee each of the same areas. The profligate waste of limited time that results is matched only by the frustration of those attempting to make policy - or to administer it - as they discover that duplication of their effort and absence of genuine authority plagues all but those who have power of the budget and power of appointment. The cumbersome machinery of participatory democracy carried on by networks of committees, by votes of the entire faculty and student bodies, and even by

endless high-level staff discussions of matters formerly left in individual hands has produced mountains of paper, clogged day-pages, and virtually eliminated that one-to-one conversation between colleagues. Participatory democracy has also led to slower and less decisive administrative action in every area of college life. All too often processes bog down because of delay or breakdown in communication, with the result that real decision-making then reverts by default to the few individuals who have genuine power but whose accountability is now obscured by the clutter of the superimposed secondary system of governance.

The turnover in top administrative officers also takes its toll and compounds the confusion in our institutions. It has become commonplace for administrators, like faculty, to be itinerants. In spite of that fact, there are in every office of a college or university some staff who remain over 10 or 20 or 30 years, accruing a special influence and sometimes authority as a result of their long standing relationships with the faculty and with other administrators, and their intimate first-hand knowledge of the character and history of the particular institution. Their actual authority often far exceeds that normal for the positions they hold, and not infrequently interferes with the proper execution of other officers' duties. Whereas in the past those holding high office were often promoted from within, either directly from the faculty ranks or after holding successive administrative posts, it has recently become common practice to appoint men or women from non-academic professions (the lawyer or business executive, for example) or those who have distinguished themselves at other institutions. Rarely do chief executives remain in office more than a brief 5 or 6 years. The impact of the fresh perspective and objectivity these chiefs bring

frequently is damped by the inheritance of an entire staff selected and trained by one or more predecessors of very different persuasion. Then those left behind have the benefit of considerable following and knowledge of the hidden lines of communication and power within the constituency, or even control of budget there is likely to be a time of overt or covert struggle before the newcomer can operate to his own fullest capacity. If this situation obtains in the very highest administration, say between the president and his chief academic officer, or the president and his chief financial officer, especially if their understanding of the goals of the institution are not in harmony, staff, faculty and students quickly lose a sense of purposefulness, and the institution flounders in a morass of confused identity and disorientation. Such institutional tragedies are on the increase.

In the old order of college administration there was always the acknowledged danger of tyranny - despotism, however benevolent. But there were also some very real benefits to the college community and to the academic executive himself. For the community, it was economical and efficient to have final decisions made wherever possible by a single individual responsible for administering policy in a given area. There was little danger of misuse of that power so long as some appropriate body was provided to review and evaluate the officer's actions at specified intervals, and to consult and advise him in ambiguous or controversial situations. For the administrator the arrangement provided immediate feedback from his labors, and an accurate appraisal of his own effectiveness. Today few college executives (save perhaps those free agents in many schools, the directors of admissions, athletics, and financial aid) have their responsibility, authority and accountability

so clearly delineated that they can enjoy the satisfactions of accomplishment that come from a high degree of autonomy.

There have, I believe, always been two principal kinds of people drawn to administration. There are those attracted to the profession because it offers (or formerly offered) opportunities for an individual to be of service to a community whose principles and objectives he shared through enabling, fostering, and cooperative efforts. There are also those attracted to the profession because it provides an arena for contest, mastery, and external reassurance of self-importance. The administrative styles of the two types tend to be quite different. One group is most comfortable with open channels of communication, informal and egalitarian exchange, and respectful accommodation of differing points of views. The other is at ease in maximally impersonal arrangements, where title, protocol, the caucus behind closed door, or the unrecorded secret agreement grease the wheels of motion. The old adage that "it matters not only what a man does, but what manner of man it is who does it" could well have been referring to college administrators. But what manner of man - or woman - it should be who fills an executive post depends to a largely unacknowledged degree on what a given institution accepts its mission to be and for whose benefit it functions. If survival of our colleges depends upon their adoption of behavior developed for the efficient production of goods at a profit there is no doubt but that the future college executive must be skilled in techniques of mass instruction, the fine points of credentialling those preparing for occupations, labor negotiations, and in confrontation politics. It is questionable whether in that picture there is a place for the continuation of the American college's traditional insistence upon its

responsibility for providing support and encouragement to its individual members, students and faculty alike, and thereby for recognizing the necessity to maintain an environment condusive to the kind of education which can enable the members of a technological society to overcome the sense of worthlessness of self and meaninglessness of life that afflict so many. It is time for each of us to ask of our colleagues, and of all those others to whom we are responsible, particularly ourselves, whether this society can afford the discontinuation of humanistic, hence by definition "inefficient" institutions. We must ask, not only "administration of what, and for whom?" but "to what end?" As new modes of management replace older ways of administration in the institutions we serve, it will be the task of those of us who remember, because we have experienced them, the values of an earlier academic community, to cry like ancient prophets for rational discourse, personal humility, and a renewed commitment to institutional integrity and human concern.

WHAT RIGHTS DO COLLEGE ADMINISTRATORS NEED ANYWAY?

Reverend William C. McInnes, S.J.

Preamble

As an administrator from the West Coast, I come to this conference carrying credentials of parchment and the perspective of distance, happy to have with me my book of poetry and a general recollection of a college course in accounting--and gaining commuter's insight over Michigan.

Some of these insights are general, others concern the specific tasks of college administration.

Insights as to why there will always be college presidents: Because they work in a milieu where people want results not rhetoric. So they develop a pathological desire to explain their philosophy to anyone who will listen and hence, make brilliant expositions before search committees and learned societies--especially at a healthy distance from campus.

Insights into college administrators as persons: That they have big jobs--but not impossible ones; that they are people limited in talent and physical capacity--but they can do a job. The college presidency does not necessarily demand a charismatic genius, certified for his position in the corridors of Pow-wow by a diploma from a sensitivity session. It does help to have a celanese wash and wear disposition that is fashionable and wears well. It also helps to restrain rhetoric and guard optimism at public gatherings. For many the administrator is not only the builder of empires and bulldozer of vertical pyramids; he is, in fact, the personification for them of that "constructive ambiguity" so often praised as virtue but dreaded by subordinates. But behind image and ahead of confrontation, the administrator is simply a human being

doing a human job.

And finally, insights into truth and goals of the university: That goals are knowable and can be worked for, even though they are not always translatable into the language of physics or philosophy and cannot be totally verified by a desk calculator.

So perhaps the insight for college administrators comes to this: Not that others don't love him, but that he neither knows nor loves himself.

That is one reason for thinking about those conditions ("rights") needed to carry out his job.

- since there is little agreement on the goals of a university today, there should be exploration of the minimum conditions needed to teach, learn and administer.
- since administrators have increasingly defensive (or utopian) feelings about their own function, they need deeper understanding of the distinctive nature of administration itself (as opposed to law, politics, or communications).
- since administration does require some ambiguity in order to move, the secure core on which change is built needs identification.
- since faculty and students often make (well-meaning) encroachments on administrative prerogatives, those prerogatives need clarification.
- since academic enterprise is going to be seeking more professional administrators to keep the institution going, there should be some effort to assure those newcomers that they are more than campus politicians or hacks.

But above all, we should be warned that statements of rights, even enshrined in parchment, are not substitutes for thinking. Thinking, too, is a basic human right--and responsibility.

INTRODUCTION

Clark Kerr, in a recent article, portrays, in Steichenesque prose, the 4 ages of the college president: minister, revolutionary giant, civil servant of the faculty, executor of growth.[1] But while photographs may suggest the future, they do not guarantee it, especially in an era of projected change and conflict. The high magic renaissance of the college as salvation for the American ideal has passed. The low visibility rumblings of "financial exigency" are being accommodated--at least temporarily. A group of college presidents, when asked what knowledge is of most worth to them today, responded, not for a need of financial information or even how to delegate authority (they were number 2 and 3), but primarily for knowledge of the president's morals and character![2]

Surrounded by internal and external forces and striving for greater self knowledge, what conditions does a college president need today in order to: 1) survive; 2) to do his job?

I would suggest that the future college executive will need the capacity to sustain and promote structures of freedom both within and without the institution: internally to counteract the rise of politics and to offset the lack of appreciation of the role of administration; externally to counterbalance the pressures of law and the power of communications. I would like to address myself to the internal phase of the problem.

Campus Politics

The rise of campus politics and the decline of an appreciation of the function of administration have emerged together as one consequence of rapid and complex growth of institutions of higher learning since World War II. The teacher and student no longer sit quietly at the end of the Hopkins log, but, in fact, engage in some log rolling as well as sitting. Nor are administrators above a little pushing and shoving in the lumber yard to break up logjams or to increase the pile. Academic life has become academic enterprise - with resulting political and administrative consequences that affect the quality of that life greatly.

Politics has always been (and will be) a part of academic life. What is new is the intensity and scope of it on university campuses today. The rapid growth of faculty, administrative staffs and student bodies, all sharing a wide cultural aspiration for self determination, has provided fertile soil for new opportunities, new clashes, and new modes of action. While the ideal model for a college might be a community of scholars, the empirical evidence - most recently documented at Stanford - indicates that it is today largely a political institution.

Vested interests of faculty, students, and administrators, joined in common cause against federal government priority reversals or internal campus budget cuts, harden into blocs, caucuses, lobbies. Modes of action - collective bargaining, affirmative action, surveys, polling constituencies - frequently replace the staid unstructured approach of thinking about problems, then "leave it to the dean." The spontaneous energy of demonstrations, so popular only a few years ago, has been

channelled into more sophisticated, systematic approaches to problem solving. Demonstrations have been institutionalized into politics and law as vehicles of decision making. Financial restrictions in the past 4 years have provided a major environment for change - and spawned new political organizations and actions as by-products.

Not surprisingly, less prestigious institutions in many ways are more subject to the undesirable consequences of increasing political action on campus than are their more famous sisters. Where academic tradition is strong and self possessed, politics only nibbles at the edge. Where it is weak, and where there is a tendency to imitate other institutions, political action can chew deeply into the academic core. Sometimes the indigestion in small stomachs is fatal.

The Limits of Politics

Campus politics, I believe, will always be a part of campus life. The challenge is to limit it, not to deny it. And limit it by community action. Just as neither teaching or learning can thrive where politics becomes consuming, so administration cannot operate effectively if it becomes politicized.

This suggests the need for deepening understanding of all as to the limits of politics as a mode of campus activity, the development of better communications between all parties on campus, and the conscious acceptance of political restraint when it threatens the academic heart of the institution. For each of these tasks, administrative leadership is required and administrative rights are imperative.

The Possibilities of Administration

Administrators will, therefore, have to help the academic community deepen its own sense of academic identity and to realize the integral role that administrators play in the life of the institution. It is the presumptions, as much as the logic, of academicians that must be clarified. The negative image of the administrator in both fact and fancy not only makes it difficult to rationalize the need for more assistance as complexity increases ("not another dean in student affairs?") but also extends the alleged power threat of administration to other uninformed groups.

The Chairman of the Faculty Senate at Iowa State sees as a threat to faculty influence: 1) professional administrators, "a new managerial class,"; 2) non academic staff, "now becoming unionized and politicized; 3) students, "whose new power comes from recognition by politicians that students represent far more votes than faculty members do."

The City of San Francisco provides a Grand Jury to investigate its public school administrators. When the Jury publicly announces that the central office administrators "are a tight oligarchy of uncaring and unfeeling tenure holders," it certainly doesn't raise the prospects for more applicants. Hopefully, Senates and Grand Juries would have some canons before pronouncing judgments - or sentence!

Organication and Communication

Organization of administrators is one counter-attach, There does exist new a national professional association of unversity administrators (the American Association of University Administrators). San

Francisco has its own Local 690, Brotherhood of Teamsters for School Administrators. A new Academy for Academic Personnel Administration has been formed in Rochester for four-year college administrators who have bargained with faculty unions.

Better communications offer an alternative to organizational huddling together. Improved communications on campus are a powerful force in offsetting frustration and bureaucracy. The more we can centralize a communications system on campus the more we can decentralize authority. The more we can explain to our publics (who don't really want to know except when something goes wrong) the necessary functions of administration, the more blunted will be attacks in time of crisis. The more we are able to look at - and laugh at - our own bureaucracy, the healthier will be our campus climate. And perhaps if that is done continuously, truthfully, and broadly, others will begin to respect administration as a necessary partner - with teaching and learning - of the academic enterprise.

Restraints and Respect

But more than organization and communication are needed. The restraint of politics and the increase of appreciation for administration's legitimacy are two important conditions for the future effectiveness of university administration.

An emerging complication for this restraint and respect is the rising demand for accountability from all segments of the academic establishment and the public. With an inherently diffuse decision

making apparatus and new power blocs in University Senates, Student Governments, autonomous departments, bureaucratic administrative offices, the college president is going to need more than a AAA card (autonomy, authority and accountability) to service the campus car when it breaks down. How to furnish accountability while protecting autonomy and preserving authority is a new game without many rules. It will not be accomplished by Adam Smith's "invisible hand." There is no Aristotelian principle of the drama to guide us; the drama is just being written. There is, however, a growing demand to get the academic job done somehow. It is easy to buy seedlings for academic flowers. The difficult task is in making them grow. Everyone wants the results, but the gardeners are few. If administration becomes politicized, in the minds of either those who practice it or those who benefit from it, neither growth nor accountability will be enhanced.

ADMINISTRATORS' RIGHTS

Thus, in my opinion, the rights surrounding the administrator's job, as contrasted to those which surround his person, are the most critical in the days ahead. Essentially it is his right to administer that requires respect from other parties and a deepening understanding by himself.

An education reporter for the San Francisco Chronicle, when shown the Rights for Administrators by a zealous PR man, shrugged his editorial shoulders and wrote:

> "These just don't appeal to me. I can find nothing that administrators are asking for that they have not enjoyed for years...As I said earlier, there are probably scores

of things on your campus which would be welcomed by The Chronicle. This just isn't one of them."

When Dr. Alexander Heard keynoted the AAC meeting last January on the Triple A, he spoke like a modern St. Francis, distinguishing the things we can change and not change and knowing the difference. He singled out the need to protect individual freedom to "think, speak, publish, teach, criticize without fear."[3] But he made no claims for any right to administer freely. Who speaks for that?[4]

Conclusion

If higher education is to thrive, someone must speak for institutional freedom and the right to administer. And someone must hear. The ashes of Antioch may have more to teach us than the guns of Kent State.

I have suggested that rights for administrators are helpful in creating a structure of freedom within the university - the administrator's primary task. They are also helpful in protecting the academic institution from external pressures: legal tactics which are becoming more widespread each day as they impinge on the delicate and sometimes naive, academic machinery of the academic process (NLRB representation, affirmative action, due process, protests, and job security cases); alternate mass communications activities which by their impact threaten to overshadow the isolated life of the campus (external degrees, electronic technology, "op-ed" approaches to journalism). But that is a further story for another time. . . .

Codes of conduct, even hung in parchment, are little more than accumulated thinking. They have no power of coercion or juridical authority. But they can be helpful, I believe , in furthering the appreciation of administration by others and in deepening our own understanding of it.

I conclude that an appreciation by others of those rights needed by an administrator to carry out the assignment to administer the university and a deepening understanding of those rights by the incumbent are crucial today when there is danger of erosion of the academic core of our universities by the internal pressures of politics and poor appreciation of administration and by the external pressures of law and other communication forms.

So if the hymn to intellectual beauty, which Shelley promises to "bring truth and grace to Life's unquiet dream" is to be shared by college administrators as something less than a nightmare, all will have to recognize administration as a legitimate partner in academic enterprise.

Perhaps like Taylor Caldwell's dynastic family, the administrator is "never victorious, never defeated."

But he should have a chance to do his job.

NOTES:

1. Clark Kerr, "Administration in an Era of Change and Conflict," Educational Record (54:1)Winter, 1973, 28 - 46.

2. Minard Stout, "Preliminary Report on Study What Knowledge Is Most Worth to a President of a College," Center for Study of Higher Education, Arizona State University, February 28, 1972.

3. Alexander Heard, "Autonomy, Authority and Accountability," Liberal Education (59:1) March, 1973, p. 10.

4. Of William McInnes, "A Statement of Rights for College Administrators," The Journal of Higher Education (42:5) May 1971, 374-386 for a discussion of administrators' rights under the headings of freedom of access to the university, freedom in his office, freedom on and off campus, and due process. This statement has been adopted as a code of rights by the American Association of University Administrators.

Discussion Groups

Monday June 18th

Forum I — Colonnade West

"The President and His Board"

Chairman: Vernon Lisbon, Member, Board of Regents, State of Rhode Island; Regional Director, National Conference of Christians and Jews

Resource Analyst: Michael Walsh, S.J., Consultant to the President, University of Massachusetts, Former President, Fordham University

Recorder: William R. Dunfey, Doctoral Candidate, Higher Education, Boston College

Forum II — Colonade East

"Faculty Power, Collective Bargaining and Contracts"

Chairman: John J. Carpenter, Attorney, Special Staff Representative, Massachusetts Federation of Teachers

Resource Analyst: Donald Walters, Deputy Director, Massachusetts College System; Specialist in Collective Bargaining, Trustees of State Colleges

Recorder: Richard Rossi, Doctoral Candidate, Higher Education, Boston College

Forum III — Lobby Salon

"Who's Accountable For What To Whom?"

Chairman: Evan R. Collins, Professor of Higher Education, Boston College; Former President, State University of New York at Albany

Resource Analyst: Arthur Corazzini, Deputy Chancellor, Massachusetts Board of Higher Education

Recorder: Richard Morrison, Doctoral Candidate, Higher Education, Boston College

Forum IV — Huntington Foyer

"Who Decides Where the College Is Going?"

Chairman: John Bolin, Director of Institutional Planning and Research, Boston College

Resource Analyst: Sydney G. Tickton, Vice President, Academy for Educational Development

Recorder: James Salvucci, Doctoral Candidate, Higher Education, Boston College

Tuesday June 19

Forum V — Colonnade West

"To What Extent Do Students, Employees, and Other Clients Become Involved in University Decisions?"

Chairman: Donald J. White, Dean, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Boston College

Resource Analyst: Kermit Morrissey, President, Boston State College

Recorder: James McGovern, Doctoral Candidate, Higher Education, Boston College

Forum VI — Colonade East

"The Use of Consultants and Advisory Councils"

Chairman: Vincent Nuccio, Director, Center for Field Research and School Services, Boston College

Resource Analyst: Mary Warner, Chairman, Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education

Recorder: Alfred Holland, Doctoral Candidate, Higher Education, Boston College

Forum VII — Lobby Salon

"The Female Executive"

Chairman: James Bowditch, Associate Professor, Organizational Studies Program, University Committee on the Role of Women, Boston College

Resource Analyst: Eileen Morley, Lecturer in Psychology, Harvard Business School

Recorder: Rae K. O'Neill, Doctoral Candidate, Higher Education, Boston College

Forum VIII — Huntington Foyer

"The College Administrator as an Ethical Leader"

Chairman: Edward J. Bloustein, President, Rutgers University

Resource Analyst: Bernard W. Harleston, Dean of the Faculty, Tufts University

Recorder: Rhoda Epstein, Doctoral Candidate, Higher Education, Boston College

FORUM I - THE PRESIDENT AND HIS BOARD

An inteoduction of Father Walsh was made by Vernon Lisbon. The topic was the President and the Board of Trustees with focus on private colleges. Father Walsh then made the introductory remarks.

Introductory Remarks (Fr. Walsh)

A recent trend involves the higher visibility of the board of trustees--often the board has found its decisions and members themselves controversial. The board is now more representative--another trend of the last few years. Frequently students have assailed the representation on the board.

The board must recognize its various functions--it cannot alllow itself to exert only minimal responsibilities. The selection of the president is its prime function. This responsibility demands an intimate knowledge of the college. The board is now facing new responsibilities; legal issues, fiscal solvency, budget review, collective bargaining, student dissent. The board, though, must be diligent in confining its time to the fundamental issues, especially long-range planning and thus the establishing of priorities. The board must not be bogged down in routine matters. The board should also act as buffers, as watchdogs, between the president and the public. In this way the members can further assist the president.

The president and his staff should educate the members of the board. They should draw up concise packets of information, orient new members (to the board and the college), arrange suitable agenda--all three are prerequisities for a successful board. The board members should be exposed to faculty and student leaders.

The standing committees are important. They should discover the pros and cons of an issue and suggest alternative solutions--these will then be presented to the full board. A close relationship between the president and the chairman of the board is very helpf l. This should be on a more informal basis--free discussion of problems and agenda items.

The process of finding new trustees is important. Today the composition of the board is crucial. It is best to have a board whose members possess varied backgrounds--thus bringing to the board sundry talents and perspectives.

Questions

Q. How can a typical trustee have a relationship with the president and the college?

A. Committee structure is the vehicle to know faculty, students, problems. The president and his staff must interest the trustee in the college and thereby forestall the trustee interested only in the prestige of his position.

Q. Streamline the number of board members?

A. Eighteen to twenty is the ideal number--in light of the effectiveness of the committee structure and the committee's reports to the whole body.

Q. Should the president ask the trustee for money?

A. In private colleges the president usually does this.

Q. What type of item is mere validation?

A. Granting of degrees, acceptance of reports, some committee reports.

Q. What should the relationship of the president be with the committee?

A. He should assign a staff assistant to sit in, etc. This person would be an ex officio member of the committee.

Q. Faculty on the board?

A. There is the problem of vested interest. I recommend non-voting status for faculty and student reps. Or they could be members on the committees.

Q. How do you monitor conflicting relationships of administrative people in the board meetings?

A. Careful meeting of president and staff before the meeting should diminish this. Also, trustee complaints, etc., should be delegated to the chairman to handle in one way or another. With "insiders" at board meetings it's tough to keep information confidential.

Q. Role of president at board meeting?

A. The president should be mostly silent. Follow the agenda: committee reports, discussion, staff reports. At end of the meeting the president should give a brief report on what's happening on campus.

Q. Use of publications?

A. Not much. Send the Chronicle to board members.

Q. Socializing at board?

A. No drinks before the meeting; socializing after the meeting. There is the time problem for most board members. A good chairman will moderate and modfy discussion with the time factor in mind.

Q. Public college and its peculiar problems?

A. Boards must be buffers between the university and the legislature. Especially the chairman--a key role. One trustee should know intimately the politicians.

Q. Should all policies be approved by the board?

A. Yes. But not operations.

Q. Should the president educate the board members so as to confirm or especially change the institution?

A. First educate the board as to college and education in general. At Fordham my allies for change were the students. Have board members meet the students--dispel the stereotypes especially those of the trustees.

Q. Composition of the board?

A. Formerly lawyers and businessmen. Now other occupations are represented. For instance, faculty from other colleges.

Q. Should the board publicize or disseminate in some fashion the discussion and proceedings of the meeting?

A. As soon as possible after the meeting issue minutes with certain omissions (names, etc.).

Q. Open or executive sessions?

A. Some committees should be open. Not enough time, on private college boards, to have open sessions. Lisbon: In Rhode Island there are open sessions,but few attend.

Q. Experience with sabbaticals for presidents?

A. Boards should arrange for this. Danforth Foundation has done this in the past--usually for four months.

Q. (Harlan Cleveland) Problem of faculty collective bargaining--possible conflict with faculty sitting on the Board? Five-year contracts instead of serving at the pleasure of the Board, for the president? Non-renewable five-year contracts?

A. That's feasible. More freedom for the president to act. . .less political. An attractive proposal.

Q. If possible, devise a broader, different notion of accountability--excluding reappointment. (Harlan Cleveland)

Audience Comment: What about the problem of security for the president?(Harlan Cleveland) President is corruptible due to his comfortable economic status. Fr. Walsh: In the public sector there is pressure from the legislature and the press. Audience: If there is a fixed period the president will have a lame-duck impotence. Fr. Walsh: Having been twice a lame duck, there is a lot you can still do.

Q. Longer terms for trustees?

A. Usually three or four years. Long terms are a bit dangerous. One problem is the retention of non-productive people.

Q. Length of trustee term coterminous with that of the president?

A. There is enough turnover. Long-standing trustees don't adapt as well to changing situations. Yet this long-standing trustee can sometimes be a buffer with the politicians.

Vernon Lisbon: It took me one and a half years to become knowledgeable about the R.I. system, In my experience thinking seemed to have been produced by laymen, not academics.

Q. PR function of the Board?

A. Not much. President should be highly visible--especially in public universities.

Q. Students on the board--do they lessen rigidity?

A. They do combat rigidity, but they cause negative things too. (Harlan Cleveland) Board should be the buffer between the college and the public legislature. The board should have outsiders and minority representation.

Q. Are minorities represented in both public and private colleges' boards?

A. Yes.

Audience comment: Do poor colleges need rich men as trustees?

A. A cross section is important. A board needs an individual who's good at fundraising; also a lawyer, a financier, an academician, one or two people whose names are immediately recognizable in the community.

V. Lisbon: U.S. is more conservative in the '70s. Boards are tending to be more elitist--as they were in the past.

(Harlan Cleveland) President of state-wide system tends to lose his campus constituency. He becomes recognized on campus as executive

of the board and blood-brother of the state finance director. State officials still regard him as an academic. This no-man's land for the president is becoming institutionalized. I believe also that unionization will cancel out local practices on individual campuses of state-wide system.

Q. If private colleges are to seek public funds, should they attract politically powerful trustees?

A. Yes. Private trustee must get much more politically oriented.

FORUM II - FACULTY POWER, COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND CONTRACTS

Donald Walters, Deputy Chancellor for the Board of Trustees of the State College System began the proceedings by tracing the current history of collective bargaining in Higher Education.

President John Kennedy's Executive Order in 1961 was marked as the significant beginning for effective collective bargaining in the public sector. By the mid-sixties, about one hundred junior colleges were organized. In 1968 and 1969 some major colleges organized and in 1969, City University of New York became the first major university to do so. Presently about fifty institutions are organized with half of these under contract. Most such activity is found in the Midwest and the Northeast with Massachusetts and Pennsylvania being most highly involved.

Walters singled out six trends or developments one should note. First the development of collective bargaining laws should be examined. Thirty two states have such laws; however, not all laws allow faculties to negotiate as in New Hampshire. Secondly, the development of collective bargaining has been regional. The East and Midwest have developed rapidly but in Florida and California collective bargaining rights for faculty have yet to be accepted. Thirdly, faculty motivation has been a factor. Economic reasons may not be the sole reason for organizing. Some faculties want assurance of participation in the decision-making process. Fourth, institutions themselves are changing and collective bargaining may provide faculty some security during this transition. Next, students are increasingly moving in on the bargaining table. Sixth, the role played by the college executive and the impact of collective bargaining on campus life is evolving new perspectives. Lastly, collective bargaining may bring about rigidity and paralysis, freezing the institution in time and space by affecting legislatures or recreating a style of peaceful co-existence and a polarization of the community.

These trends are best summed up by Walters' query: 'Will collective bargaining by 1980 reduce the President to a ministerial capacity or contract administrator; will the institution be frozen and non-innovative?"

As a negotiator, Walters saw three possible biases, namely, the vested interests of the participants, management limitations, and institutional bias.

Using these as a frame of reference an observer can follow the predominant developmental trends of collective bargaining. The first situation revolves around the collision course of unions and colleges where the "industrial" model of collective bargaining has accented the difference in role status and rights of the college community. Secondly, situations where the adversary relationship has replaced the collegial one. Lastly, as in the K-12 movement, a division of rights between employer and employee has been sharply drawn and observed by both sides.

The early seventies had to face up to these choices. It was Walters' contention that innovation and experimentation provided the options to head off the collision courses at the table. He laid claim that redesigning the collective bargaining process not avoiding the issues held a possible solution to the problems at the table. He advocated "structural" bargaining. This model incorporated a college constitution into the contract. "Admittedly these can be risk involved in power and control shifts," he said. However, he went on to say, "it is more desirable to shift from administration to faculty rather than a union local."

It should be pointed out at this point that in Walters' "structural" bargaining model all faculty members are eligible to participate through the union in the contract machinery regardless of whether they are dues paying union members.

Attorney John Carpenter of the Massachusetts Federation of Teachers (M.F.T.) responded. He pointed out that when two parties meet at the table they must be and in fact are adversary but this does not negate collegiality or institutional bias.

In 1965 the M.F.T. started at the table with Elementary and Secondary Teacher proposals. However, eighty-five per cent of these proposals were of educational not compensatory concern. Although the public is told unions seek just money for teachers, class size, programs, workload and due process have wrought more discussion and concern across this state than money. It should be noted that in Massachusetts, faculties are not allowed to bargain for salaries.

In 1969 the M.F.T. was approached by parties in higher education not so much for monetary concerns but because of campus unrest, terminal contracts, incompetent and arbitrary administration. Admittedly, the M.F.T. did not know what it was getting into. He went on to say, "Massachusetts has been a unique experience for us, we listened, judged by our secondary experience, and witnessed some of the most vicious strikes we had ever experienced in Massachusetts. We knew professionally and educationally we were in over our heads. We found faculty were inexperienced about what they wanted."

The following remarks pointed out the M.F.T attempts to help individual locals write proposals, identify their needs, temper their actions into constructive modes and educate their members in contract implementation. However, it must be noted that the M.F.T. acts only in an advisory role and that individual locals are autonomous and free to accept or reject any suggestions.

Presently between the State Division of Colleges and Southeastern Massachusetts University, the M.F.T. has four contracts. Initially, many problems beset negotiations at the State College System. It was at this point Dr. Walters took over negotiations and brought the idea of governance into collective bargaining. From 1969 to the present, the concept was hashed out on the table. The M.F.T. agreed that something is needed to preserve the delicate relationships and freedom needed on

the campus. Higher education needed a new model for college faculties. The M.F.T. recognized that all faculty not just union members must contribute to the decision-making process. It was for this reason that the M.F.T. opted for the freest participation of the faculty regardless of their dues paying status. This has not gone altogether uncriticized by some M.F.T. leaders. However, it was held that through negotiations the conditions of employment and the necessary welfare items could be separated out. Faculties seem to be convinced that this is worth trying but Mr. Carpenter pointed out that there is no experience anywhere from which one can draw encouragement or discouragement. He remarked that the "industrial" model cannot apply to higher education if higher education is going to survive. The college community seems to be seeking guidance in collective bargaining. Mr. Carpenter ended with an observation. In his travels he finds that in Massachusetts an interested and willing faculty and a sincere administration are seeking to make contracts work. Lack of experience and knowledge about living with a contract was cited by the attorney as a general weakness that can easily be overcome by each side instructing its members how to live with the contract and each other.

There followed a two hour question and answer period. Although several points were elaborated upon the most notable one concerned merit pay. M.F.T. spokesman Carpenter admitted merit is opposed on the secondary level but not in higher education. He felt faculties wanted it and needed it.

Mr. Carpenter concluded by formally adjourning the forum and invited the guests to peruse the various contracts at the front of the room.

FORUM III- WHO'S ACCOUNTABLE FOR WHAT TO WHOM?

Dr. Corazzini stated what he thinks has happened to higher education. He presented two main points. During the '60s public and private higher education enrollments were expanding, and they were expanding with gross disparities in the tuition costs for the students in public and private education. It was much more expensive to go to a private school than a public school, but both sectors were able to expand, and as they expanded the proportion of people going on from high school to college went up. Was this expansion in higher education enrollments necessary? Perhaps not, says Dr. Corazzini.

Secondly, Dr. Corazzini says, by the end of the '60s, private schools were in trouble because the public schools had expanded to the point and had spent the money; they looked like a very reasonable alternative to the private schools; and as a result private school enrollments were dropping dramatically by the end of the '60s, while public higher education was increasing exponentially.

He went on to say that economists have a "double rule of thumb", i.e., they listen to the decision maker (in this case, the higher education administrator), find out what exactly it is he wants to do, and tell him the most efficient way to do it. They don't form the objectives; they just find out what they are, and tell the decision makers the best way to reach the objectives.

Now in the case of higher education, economists came into conflict with administrators because they didn't know what their objectives were. So how could economists be held accountable? When educators did list objectives for higher education, they were catastrophic.

"For example," Dr. Corazzini stated, "suppose that we (economists) had accepted the objective that everyone who graduated from high school ought to go to a public university, because public universities are inherently better than private universities; because there are special external benefits from going to a public university as opposed to a private university. The kinds of policy recommendations that could come forth would have been high subsidy rates, charging zero tuition, or maybe even paying people to go. Another recommendation might have been to put absolute bans on state aid to private schools for any purpose whatsoever. Educators would have been unhappy with the efficiency experts, when all they were really doing was being very good at their limited task figuring out an efficient way to accomplish a goal."

Dr. Corazzini continued that there is confusion today, and many objectives are ill-defined; and the rationale that "We don't have to tell you what we're trying to do, because whatever it is, it's good because higher education is essentially good. He emphasized that educators must state and identify objectives--to refuse to identify them is the limit to provide some license for total inefficiency and organizational anarchy.

Corazzini continued that the illicit search for money often determines the direction of academic programs, regardless of demand, need, or actual legitimacy. He used as an example the great expansion of vocational education in the 1960s. While acknowledging the very real need for properly planned and implemented programs, he scorned the many ill-equipped, improperly managed and purposeless programs established simply for the acquisition for available grant monies.

"Does a private school have a public purpose? Can it legitimately make the argument that it needs state aid, not because it's going out of business, but because low income students ought to have a choice between private and public schools?" He said he could not understand why the horizontal organizational form on campus is a detriment to the administrator when he wants to change something at the departmental level, but doesn't aid him when he wants to change something at the administrative level.

Dr. Corazzini feltthat he is not as critical as he might sound in regard to higher education. He feels that the free market situation mechanism in education is very efficient; and continuing education, he feels is the clearest example of the free market in public opinion, and non-profit kinds of organizations.

"But," he said, "if you want other things which involve making decisions about the number of people involved in socioeconomic composition of people going on in higher education, in splits between public and private, and the kinds of student choices you're going to present to the market place, and the kind of accountability you have regarding manpower programs if they don't work. To do all this you need a data base, you need a management information system; you need decision makers who will discuss in free and impartial forums the consequences of the kinds of findings that come out of these exercises. The decision makers should fight the board on their own campuses if they want those objectives.

Therefore, if educators don't specify what they want, then others may begin to make those decisions, which, of course, is less than desirable.

Corazzini went on to say that he doesn't think higher education has made its case, because it hasn't stated its case in quantitative terms. In other words, when you're an economist and you're faced with evaluating programs, would you ever use anything but an economic criterion to judge it?

In terms of education, a school has some sort of role--it has to define its objectives in order that a discussion can be formed to show that his resource allocation or decision to put resources into a particular area, moves that school down the road towards where it wants to go.

Questions then arise as to how much of the way of resources and what kind of insurances do educators want to build into what they want to do.

Dr. Corazzini concluded his statements by saying that it is very unfortunate that a situation has to be set up where educators are on one side and economists are on the other. But those in positions to measure (Mass. Board of Higher Education) need to evaluate requests from colleges. This evaluation represents a kind of accountability.

"If you don't know what happens to your graduates in very concrete terms, then you can't answer questions when an evaluating board says they can't acknowledge your request for more money for occupational education because schools don't follow up on how effective they are in preparing their students for their future occupations. Education is not able to measure the dollar effectiveness of what they are doing."

Finally, there are two points on which both Dr. Colling and Dr. Corazzini feel everyone can agree. First, that there are many aspects in college, university and management that are subject to systems analysis. Secondly, that there are many aspects of the college and university that go beyond that kind of measurement (quantitation).

Therefore, the underlying and unsolved question becomes, "What are these kinds of measurements and who applies them? To whom are we all accountable?"

FORUM IV - WHO DECIDES WHERE THE COLLEGE IS GOING?

Sidney Tickton stated that in regard to deciding where the college is going the planner must assume that society will "muddle through" the next 10 to 15 years and emerge essentially unchanged from the present. Such problems as poverty and pollution, for example, will still be unresolved. No war or catastrophic disturbances will exist and the population will continue to grow. The number of people employed will expand and there will be a continued need for education. Hence, enrollments in higher education should show an increase through 1980, level off temporarily during that decade and begin an upward swing again in the 1990's.

Rising educational costs and declining birth rates will be balanced by several trends. These counter-forces include (1) increased enrollment of poor and disadvantaged students; (2) married women who now desire a college education; (3) retraining of employees; (4) upgrading of basic employability requirements to at least the two-year degree and (5) the population's general belief in a right to a college education. These counter-forces, however, will not lead to increased enrollments for all institutions. Two and four-year urban colleges and universities and special schools will profit most in terms of increased enrollments. At present, declining enrollments are "nagging irritants" for most schools, but rumblings throughout the Nation are beginning to occur.

Another problem area that seems to be critical for most institutions is the spiraling cost of operation. "Per student costs" are rising faster than enrollments and thus "budget balancing binges" are occuring with increasing frequency. The division of financial support for higher education between parents, the Federal government and private philanthropy remains largely unresolved.

The management of institutions is still another dilemma. Academe does not follow the corporate model of sequential steps and training for top level administrators. Instead we simply recruit someone who has been a faculty member, perhaps a chairman, and pay him 40-50% more than other top faculty members. In the vast majority of cases, he has had virtually no professional training. Yet he suddenly finds himself charged with the enormous responsibility of running an institution. Higher administrative salaries are needed to enable institutions to "buy" the expertise they will need in the future.

A third critical problem that must be resolved in the future is the improvement of learning. Studies have shown that although a variety of teaching methods are utilized, the most prominent modes are lecture-discussions. In addition, even when more innovative techniques are applied in the classroom no significant differences in learning become manifest. Clearly, the actual process of learning must be examined more fully.

In sum, in the future three problems must be acknowledged and solved, and their determination will have considerable impact on the direction

of institutions of higher learning. Briefly stated, the problems are: the improvement of financial mechanisms for higher education; the improvement of the selection of higher education managers; and the improvement of the learning.

Future college administrators, noted Chairman Bolin, must also look for unexpected demands. He pointed out that new pressures from the poor and disadvantaged, females and changing employment requirements dictate that the administrator must be readily adaptable to change. Educational leaders must, therefore, remain flexible.

(The discussion that followed the opening remarks appears below, and is essentially unchanged save for minor editing.)

Q. Is it <u>who</u> or <u>what</u> that decides where the college is going?

A. A little bit of both. Pressures come from students, especially when enrollments are low or declining, and of course from those who "foot the bill" at the public institutions. The direction of money is also of importance. The counter-balance to these pressures at most institutions--trustees, faculty and administrators--are also of importance in determining direction. However, their collective influence on direction has been lessened because of financial problems and declining enrollments. One key to "who" is the purpose of the plan and the selection of the planning groups membership. Three options exist, (1) broad representation; (2) narrow, top-down membership and (3) a middle position. The third option would be advocated for most planning endeavors for it takes advantage of the benefits of the first two, and eliminates most of the detrimental aspects of either broad or narrow representation on planning committees.

Q. Can long-range planning predict future student curricula?

A. Unfortunately, academicians become so specialized that they have difficulty participating openly in planning activities. For example, consider the shift in language requirements and the subsequent inability of language faculty to "convert" to other teaching areas. Institutions and their faculties must realize that they need to be flexible; however, at this juncture most are not, and thus it is extremely difficult to make accurate long-range predictions regarding curricular changes.

Q. What is the <u>key</u> factor for long-range planning?

A. Flexible, convertible people are absolutely essential to long-range planning and considerable attention must be devoted to the development of these basic characteristics. Part of this is an attitude toward life-long learning in that those who continue to learn probably can be converted and those who do not have this attitude probably cannot be converted. Professional schools (medicine, law) drill their students on the need for life-long learning, but it is doubtful that other schools attempt to instill this value in their students.

Q. What effect will regionalization or state committees have on the direction of our institutions in the future?

A. Private institutions often band together in the face of state or regional committees to (1) protect themselves and (2) represent themselves more effectively to the various state legislators. Nevertheless, over the next decade there will be a marked increase in both regionalization and inter-institutional cooperation that will be designed to respond to declining enrollments and reduced financial support.

Q. Should we change the college curriculum to attract more students to our institutions?

A. Yes, but not solely to attract more students. What seems needed most is a "relevant" curriculum--one that prepares students with the skills required to live in the future and also prepares them for life-long learning. In the past, students have been a captive audience, for they commonly believed that a little education was better then no education. Further, census figures have been used to show that those with college degrees have better jobs; however, it has yet to be demonstrated that better jobs and higher earnings are necessarily correlated with more education. In addition, a study of the "market" and subsequent shift of curricular patterns does not automatically mean that the new programs will be any better than the old ones.

Q. What <u>can</u> long-range planning do, and what <u>can't</u> long-range planning do?

A. Long-range planning helps establish optional plans as opposed to a single master plan. It also helps the institution maintain flexibility. Frequently, the subjects that are discussed by planning groups are those that in different circumstances are considered "fighting questions". For example, student-faculty ratios, while considered a good management device, often raise questions of value and worth in the minds of faculty. As a side benefit planning groups often become educational or informational forums for the constituent groups of the institution. Long-range planning, however, cannot make decisions for administrators and the findings and recommendations of planning groups should not be construed as "the truths to be chiseled in concrete". Any long-range plan can only serve as a guide for the institution; it should not serve as the boundary.

FORUM V - TO WHAT EXTENT TO STUDENTS, EMPLOYEES, AND OTHER CLIENTS BECOME INVOLVED IN UNIVERSITY DECISIONS?

The exceptionally provocative presentation by Kermit Morrissey revolved around the external threats facing higher education today and in the near future. Dr. Morrissey sees higher education being diverted from its purpose and mission as the result of excessive fragmentation. Universities are losing their sense of purpose because their constituents are being seduced or driven to organizations outside the university in order to fulfill their perceived needs. In this way the University becomes a collection of members from diverse social organizations meeting in the same place only because that's where they always met before even though all sense of a community with a collective mission has vanished.

Dr. Morrissey is convinced that increased institutional involvement by faculty, students and administration is not only inevitable but also essential to the survival of higher education. Meaningful involvement will, however, require that the internal community be reconstituted organizationally (i.e. written rules and written agreements as to who is responsible for what) in order to insure teleological and procedural agreement. Dr. Morrissey is convinced that written agreements between faculty, students, and administration are the only way of insuring that the critical questions are faced and answered.

The three major constitutive elements currently involved in decision making in higher education are faculty, students and administration. Dr. Morrissey noted that: the administration is paid to administer so its involvement will continue; the faculty for idealistic and base reasons perceives its vested interest as being directly affected so its involvement will continue; the students, though a required participant in decision making as the result of the last four years, are becoming increasingly indifferent to the governance of higher education. Interestingly enough, Dr. Morrissey notes, the stress on consumerism and the reduced demand for higher education will force the faculty and administration to devise some way of enticing the students to participate in the decision making process in order to benefit from their perspective and to make them feel genuinely part of a community. Students are no longer a threat and we must find a way, for our benefit and theirs, of meaningfully institutionalizing their involvement.

Dr. Morrissey also examined the great number of disenfranchised members of the university community, the 20-60% of the university population, who because they are not contractually or meaningfully related to the mission of the university have the least inducement for participation, high morale or creativity. The maintenance and secretarial staff are looked on as non-members of the collegiate community whose services, professional or not, have no relationship to the overall mission of the university or the community that constitutes that university. Dr.Morrissey feels that these members of the community must be represented for their benefit and the benefit of the community as a whole. Despite the barriers that traditionally have set these groups apart Dr. Morrissey is convinced that we need more participation from all the participants in the great world of higher education.

Initiating his presentation with a warning against the excessive fragmentation caused by diverse groups represented by diverse organizations, Dr. Morrissey concluded his presentation by calling for the establishment of more institutionally comprehensive and less culturally homogeneous bargaining units which would unite each campus or university with a single mission, defend it against external threats, preserve the essentials of institutional autonomy and relate, for every member of a university community, his or her daily work to the purpose of the university.

FORUM VI - THE USE OF CONSULTANTS AND ADVISORY COUNCILS

Mary Warner (Chairman, Massachusetts Advisory Council on Education) reported on the purposes, powers, activities, and future plans of MACE. Briefly, the Council (nine members) is "an independent state agency, created by special legislative enactment, for the purpose of recommending policies to improve all phases of public education in Massachusetts". To achieve this goal the Council draws on a wide variety of volunteer specialists and organizations to conduct and advise on its studies. Its expert panel sometimes grows to twenty-five in number. The panel also recommends to the Governor candidates for the Boards of Education and Higher Education and the Board of Trustees of State Colleges.

As a neutral mechanism for study, discussion, and action, the Council represents an impetus toward objective long-range planning by coordinating studies and surveys. A director at some specific college or university is selected to chair each study. Since 1966 over twenty-five studies have been commissioned. Ideas for study emanate from various sources. The panel and staff then set priorities in order to select areas which they deem representative of statewide problems. High consideration is given to such factors as need, importance, feasibility, potential for implementation and support, competent expertise, costs and multiple funding possibility.

Studies conducted range from surveys in early childhood, vocational and secondary education to higher and adult education; from economic and organizational examinations of schools to analysis of building construction, compensatory education, teacher certification and elementary science curriculum. Lacking legislative or executive authority to implement findings and recommendations, the Advisory Council depends largely on the merit and persuasiveness of these studies to provide impetus for others to take action. This power vacuum helps maintain council integrity and independence, but also creates implementation problems.

The Council hopes that its involvement of key educators as well as non-educators will "build in" the stimulus for change while a study is in process. Whenever possible, the Council cooperates and works with groups seeking to act upon a completed study's recommendations.

A present reorganization in the State Board of Education may cause what Ms. Warner feels may be trouble. The Secretary of Education wants MACE to become his personal research agency. Such an action Ms. Warner felt would taint the perceived objectivity of MACE.

An overall benefit of MACE is that it renders a general sense of what people are thinking about and what they want. In this way it can facilitate inter-institutional communication and, hopefully, share scarce resources, thereby benefiting the respective institutions engaged. A listing of major MACE studies can be found in recent study reports or through writing the Council's office.

FORUM VII - THE FEMALE EXECUTIVE

Ms. Morley described the process of social change as beginning when someone decides that the way things are in society is not acceptable and makes public complaint. If the cause is truly appropriate, people begin to listen and movement, which may be toward change in legislation, starts. After laws embodying changes are passed we move into the phase of "administrators of change" and that is where we are today. In order to achieve needed alteration in perceptions and organizational structures several changes are called for:

1. Changes in attitudes are called for, especially with regard to how women see themselves.

2. Changes in levels of competence which involves the opening of all kinds of programs to women on the level of real equality and willingness of women to commit themselves.

3. Changes in sexual behavior for men and women working together calls for a new code of social ethics.

4. Changes in what is sanctioned as appropriate administrative behavior since women as they move into responsible positions will not change their behavior (their responsiveness to feelings, intuitiveness, etc.)--the "logical line of thought", so esteemed by administrators will be debunked in the future.

Certain issues are raised by these changes. For example, what is woman's role qua woman in the new executive role? Does she see herself as "interventionist", as "feminist", opening up for other women? Or does the woman choose to be the change without being interventionist and thus serve as role model to demonstrate that women can do what formerly only men were supposed to be able to do. Another issue involves the personal qualities of women who will work comfortably with men and vice versa. And there is the issue of the challenge which women's emergence at the executive level brings to men. Here Ms. Morley, out of her experience at Harvard Business School, sees three divisions: young men (20 - early 30's) who represent the strictly traditional men at critical points in their own careers--they are on their way up and don't need extra competition from women--they also need the women to raise their children--this group demonstrates the greatest hostility; 50+ men who can look back with some satisfaction and are not too affected personally, although they may not be able to accept women as colleagues because of age since they don't like to accept the opinion of any younger person, male or female.

Ms. Morley stated four major problems which confront women who are moving up. One involves the way in which women enter equal roles. New forms of asexual relationships will be demanded. This problem arises on a one-to-one basis, and we are just beginning to be willing to look at it. A second problem centers around the general area of confidence,

both the woman's confidence in herself and her abilities and man's confidence in woman's competence. The question of allegiance, too, arises when men tend to place greater allegiance in their jobs while women will be assumed to have greater allegiance to someone outside the work sphere. There is need here for a different ordering of the quality of allegiance in order to develop "woman's credibility and reliability in the work sphere." A final problem area is the role itself. "How are women to succeed as executives without becoming men?" A women, tied into the domestic sphere, does not have as much free energy, while her male counterpart can count on the support system at home.

Five pieces of advice for a woman looking for an executive career were offered by Ms. Morley. First, be confident and aware. There is no career without a job, so choose where you want to be and aim for that target. Second, women must be prepared to make the investment of time and money which competence requires. As an example, the Harvard M.B.A. has a price tag of $12,000, Third, it is important to beware of generalizations. Make no broad assumptions, but take each event or individual separately. Fourth, don't go looking for problems, but don't ignore them when they are genuinely there. And finally, Ms. Morley decried the oft-repated question, "What is the woman's point of view?" which is often asked in the case-discussion method used at Harvard. It is rare, she maintained, that there is a strictly female point of view.

Discussion followed on woman as activist versus the role model school with participants expressing need for both types. There was considerable consensus about change in family life-style being a good thing. More sharing of work around the home, for example, is increasingly accepted.

FORUM VIII - THE COLLEGE ADMINISTRATOR AS AN ETHICAL LEADER

This forum consisted much lively discussion with many ethical issues and questions of ethical leadership were bandied about. President Bloustein opened the discussion with a number of provocative questions such as: Is the president's life style, hair, dress, etc. appropriate subjects of concern of trustees, faculty, students?

Should the administration take stands on the political issues of the day? If so, does he sacrifice the ethical neutrality of the university? Should the university be ethically neutral?

Can one separate intellectual leadership from leadership on issues of conscience?

Is the executive the manager or the leader?

Should subordinate members of the administration have the same right to take public stands as the chief executive?

There was much discussion and dissent especially concerning the latter issue. President Bloustein felt that only one person, i.e., the president, can really speak for the university, and therefore is the only one who should take a public stand. He felt that in the public eye the administrators speak for the university and one cannot have the university taking two opposing positions. He distinguished this from the faculty who,he said, are known not to speak for the university.

Dissent surrounded the issue of why all people, faculty and administration couldn't speak for themselves, as themselves, without necessarily speaking for, or comitting the university to, a certain stand. President Bloustein felt that because our society doesn't see it that way, we must bide our time until they do, and until that time the university must speak with some voice. He went on to say that he was speaking of issues where the nature of one's position gives you a forum you would not otherwise have, and was not speaking of local community issues.

Dr. Harleston felt a little differently in that he felt that the executives, including junior administrators, should not be the last to say what must be said. He said one must maintain the best sense of self, not to exploit one's position for personal gain but not to use one's position to avoid personal commitment. He said that administrators don't necessarily see things as faculty do, nor do students necessarily see them the same way. The importance, he said, was to communicate one's position and the reasons for it.

This issue was raised by Dr. Bloustein to Dr. Harleston of what would he do if he didn't agree with administrative policy. Dr. Harleston replied that if he felt he was being asked to fundamentally distort his values he could not go along with it and may quit. But if it were something relatively minor he could go along with it.

Dr. Bloustein replied that the question is how much of a distortion will you tolerate. He said that he can't oppose a stand taken by his board of governors and still keep his job. He said the problem is the relatively small issues on which he's forced to bend every day.

Both panelists agreed that it was much easier to deal with procedure conflicts than value conflicts.

The issue arose also of whether the leadership should represent the feelings of the leader of the university, i.e., the president or whether his stands should represent a majority point of view of faculty, students, and administration.

The purpose of the entire discussion was not to provide answers so much as to present the real everyday issues which those present and future executives must think about. The issue of the administrator as an ethical leader is one of those major and difficult questions which each of us must come to grips with.

* * * * *